

normal production as actually produced for the purpose of determining the amount of penalty wheat from a previous crop which can be withdrawn without penalty. If the bill is enacted, the same rule will apply to producers who do participate in the diversion program.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO THE PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE WITH CANADA

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints to attend the Parliamentary Conference with Canada the following Senators: The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. DWORSHAK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the circumstances attendant upon the flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., of the U.S. Marine Corps, in his orbit around the world, and due to the fact that we have disposed of a fairly good amount of legislation this afternoon, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 21, 1962, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 20, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Philippians 3: 14: *I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.*

Eternal God, we humbly confess that daily we are looking out upon a weary and bewildered humanity for whom the hard facts and experiences of life seem to be without sequence and significance.

Grant that we may be blessed with the spirit of sympathy and understanding and seek to minister to the deep longings and needs of mankind with the grace of generosity and good will.

Inspire us with a vision of the grandeur of a life that gives itself in devotion to Thee and puts itself on the side of faith and strives through discipline and effort to become morally and spiritually fit to attain unto the high calling of God in Christ Jesus, our Lord.

O Thou who art here and everywhere, we are sending our thoughts of love and good cheer to our fellow citizen who on this day is courageously carrying out a great mission for our beloved country and all for Thy glory.

Hear us in the name of the Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 13, 1962:

H.J. Res. 612. Joint resolution making supplemental appropriations for the Veterans' Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1962, and for other purposes.

On February 16, 1962:

H.R. 2147. An act for the relief of Kenneth Stultz;

H.R. 2973. An act for the relief of Anthony Robert Lowry (Antonio Plantadosi);

H.R. 3710. An act for the relief of Giles L. Matthews;

H.R. 4194. An act for the relief of Mrs. Ann W. Edwards;

H.R. 4211. An act for the relief of Alessandro Bottero;

H.R. 4280. An act for the relief of Dimitri Elias Sartan;

H.R. 4381. An act for the relief of Walter H. Hanson;

H.R. 4876. An act for the relief of Mary C. Atkinson;

H.R. 5181. An act to amend Private Law 85-699;

H.R. 5324. An act for the relief of Dr. Serafin T. Ortiz;

H.R. 6025. An act to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of George Edward Barnhart against the United States;

H.R. 6120. An act for the relief of Francis Ainsworth;

H.R. 6226. An act for the relief of Arlin David English;

H.R. 6243. An act extending to Guam the power to enter into certain interstate compacts relating to the enforcement of the criminal laws and policies of the States;

H.R. 6644. An act for the relief of Julius Benikosky;

H.R. 6938. An act for the relief of Dr. Robert E. Hiller;

H.R. 7473. An act for the relief of Albert R. Serpa;

H.R. 7740. An act for the relief of Mrs. Sharon Lee Harden;

H.R. 8325. An act for the relief of Harrison Thomas Harper; and

H.R. 8779. An act for the relief of George B. Olmstead.

On February 19, 1962:

H.R. 2470. An act to provide for the establishment of the Lincoln Boyhood National Memorial in the State of Indiana, and for other purposes.

FEDERAL PAY REFORM MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 344)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The success of this Government, and thus the success of our Nation, depend in the last analysis upon the quality of our career services. The legislation enacted by the Congress, as well as the decisions made by me and the Department and Agency heads, must all be implemented by the career men and women in the Federal service. In foreign affairs, national defense, science and technology, and a host of other fields, they face unprecedented problems of unprecedented importance and perplexity. We are all dependent on their sense of loyalty and responsibility as well as their competence and energy; and just as they have responsibilities to the Government, so does the Government have obligations to them.

We properly establish high standards for our public servants. We investigate their character and associations before considering them for employment. We hire them only after they have passed difficult examinations. We require them to abide by rigorous standards of conduct and ethics. We demand consistently high performance from them on the job. Accordingly, the salaries for the services they perform should be fixed under well-understood and objective standards, high enough to attract and retain competent personnel, sufficiently flexible to motivate initiative and industry, and comparable with the salaries received by their counterparts in private life. To pay more than this is to be unfair to the taxpayers—to pay less is to degrade the public service and endanger our national security.

Unfortunately these basic standards for Federal salary systems are not met today. Too many Federal employees are underpaid in proportion to their responsibilities. Too many receive smaller salaries than are paid by many private industries, and even by many States and local governments, for less responsible work. Too many top-grade or supervisory Federal employees are paid little more, and sometimes even less, than their subordinates. Too many key career employees are unable to afford continued public service.

Existing statutory Federal pay structures cannot be justified as sound and equitable, either internally or externally. Internally, salaries between various levels of work should be enough to provide an incentive to undertake more responsible duties and to represent, dollarwise, fair differences in work requirements. Over the years, piecemeal statutory revisions—with primary emphasis on bringing the lower pay levels abreast of changes in the cost of living—have severely compressed the spread between the top and bottom salaries. The 8.8

to 1 and 12 to 1 salary ratios between the highest and lowest Classification Act and postal field service grades existing prior to World War II have shrunk to ratios of less than 6 to 1, making it impossible to offer pay increases consistent with the added responsibilities of grade-to-grade promotion, or to offer an appropriate range of incentives within a particular grade. There is little consistency or logic in the salary differences between existing grade levels. And employees paid under a wage board system, with wages based on the prevailing rates in industry, are frequently paid more than their supervisors whose salaries are fixed by the more rigid and less logical provisions of the Classification Act.

Externally, except for employees paid under wage board systems, Federal salaries generally do not compare favorably and cannot compete successfully with private industry. Every objective survey has demonstrated that salaried Government employees at almost every work level receive less compensation, on a national average basis, than private employees performing similar work—and the greater the level of difficulty and responsibility, the greater the gap between Federal and private pay. A Federal employee beginning a professional or administrative career can look forward to a maximum salary increase of no more than four and one quarter times his entrance salary, whereas his counterpart in private industry can look forward to an increase of six or seven times his beginning salary. Moreover, the Federal employee's top salary, if he stays to reach it, will be less than half that of his private enterprise counterpart.

Even State and local governments have passed the Federal Government. The head of a Federal Cabinet department receives less than the head of a New York State department—less than the average salary paid to the superintendents of schools in cities over 500,000 population. The highest paid Federal employees under the Classification Act would obtain higher salaries if they were working in the State career service in Georgia, Ohio, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Michigan, or California, for example—or for the cities of St. Louis, Denver, Detroit, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Philadelphia.

The difficulty has been the lack of both an accepted objective standard for determining Federal salary levels and a consistent procedure for review and adjustment. The result has been a steady attrition of valued employees, an inability to attract many top quality college graduates and, in the long run, a waste of Federal funds—discouraging the initiative, efficiency, and dedication that accompany recognition and stature, and requiring enormous expenditures each year to recruit and train new replacements for employees who leave the service for reasons of inadequate pay. We can no longer defer the necessary corrective measures or continue the existing lack of standards; and recent studies and measurement techniques now make possible the kind of wholly new approach that commonsense requires.

A FEDERAL PAY REFORM PROGRAM

I am transmitting to the Congress with this message legislation designed to reform the major statutory salary systems of the Federal Government, benefiting all of the 1,640,000 employees throughout the world who are paid under the various Federal statutory pay plans—the Classification Act, the Postal Field Service Compensation Act, the Foreign Service Act, and the medicine and surgery salary system of the Veterans' Administration. Although flat increases for lower-paid workers are included as a matter of equity, the essence of this bill's objectives is Federal pay reform, not simply a Federal pay raise. Where pay raises result from the establishment of objective pay standards, they are primarily a reflection of the extent to which Federal salaries have lagged behind the national economy.

This proposal has two principal features:

(1) It establishes a sound, objective, and continuous standard for determining proper salary levels by following the concept of comparability—reasonable comparability with prevailing private enterprise salaries for the same levels of work insofar as this is possible, as determined from painstaking statistical surveys and careful job comparisons; and

(2) It establishes realistic and appropriate salary relationships both within and among the several statutory salary systems and each of their grade levels, by following the principle of equal pay for equal work, with distinctions in pay consistent with distinctions in responsibility and performance.

COMPARABILITY

Adoption of the principle of comparability will assure equity for the Federal employee with his equals throughout the national economy—enable the Government to compete fairly with private firms for qualified personnel—and provide at last a logical and factual standard for setting Federal salaries. Reflected in this single standard are such legitimate private enterprise pay considerations as cost of living, standard of living, and productivity, to the same extent that those factors are resolved into the "going rate" over bargaining tables and other salary determining processes in private enterprise throughout the country.

The principle has a history of wide acceptance. Within the Federal Government, it has been used for 100 years: first applied to navy yard workers, it is now applied to all Federal workers in trades and crafts, to employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and to work under Government contracts covered by the Walsh-Healey and Davis-Bacon Acts. Many State and local governments, as well as some other national governments (such as Canada and the United Kingdom) already rely on this principle.

It should be noted in this regard that, in marked contrast to the unfavorable situation of salaried employees, the Federal pay practices affecting over 660,000 workers in the skilled trades and crafts have functioned without serious conflict

or confusion. Based on prevailing rates, and set on recommendation of wage boards, their pay has been continuously maintained at levels that are fair from the viewpoint of the Government, the taxpayer, and the employee.

I have found no more sensible standard for determining Government salaries. The Advisory Panel on Federal Salary Systems, chaired by Mr. Clarence Randall, in its recent report to me called it not only equitable but valid and eminently desirable. The application of this principle permits the Government to meet its difficult personnel needs without paying more than is necessary or less than is equitable. It was not feasible in earlier years; but now the recently introduced annual survey of professional, administrative, technical, and clerical salaries conducted by the Bureau of Labor Statistics provides the objective comparative salary data needed for setting Federal pay scales. Occupational rates paid by private employers at a given work level of difficulty, responsibility, and required qualifications can be combined into a single national average private enterprise rate for work equivalent to a Classification Act grade. These Classification Act rates in turn can be used to establish rates for the corresponding grades in the specialized salary systems of the Postal Field Service, the Foreign Service, and the Veterans' Administration.

INTERNAL ALIGNMENT

The internal alignment principle rests on two basic concepts: equal pay for equal work, and distinctions in pay consistent with distinctions in work and performance. Although these concepts are stated in the present Classification Act and are implicit in the Postal Field Service Compensation Act, the regressive and flat percentage pay adjustments of the past 17 years have gradually blotted out much of the meaning in the current pay differentials of all our salary systems.

The pay schedules I am recommending will regularize and generally enlarge the differences in salaries between successive grade levels, recognizing more appropriately the differences in responsibility involved, and providing a more uniform (not less than 10 percent) progression of salary levels between the entry rates of successive grades. This will furnish a greater incentive for employees striving to prepare themselves for higher responsibilities. At the same time, these new schedules will make more meaningful the within-grade promotions for competent performance of duties, and will provide better incentives for those who spend most of their careers within a single grade by providing wider salary ranges (30 percent except for the top two grades) within each grade, more adequate and more numerous within-grade salary steps, and more flexible use of salary steps to recognize exceptional achievement.

Other provisions aimed at improving flexibility will (1) facilitate the adjustment of salaries to meet critical needs by competing more equally with private industry in areas or in occupations in which a shortage exists; (2) permit the assignment of positions to the upper

grades of the Classification Act on the basis of duties and responsibilities, instead of arbitrarily limiting the number of such positions; and (3) create new upper grades to bring within the salary provisions of the Classification Act all those with top administrative responsibilities who are not Cabinet or sub-Cabinet officers or heads of separate agencies.

The new salary ranges would provide a 30-percent range between the entry rate and the highest rate in the grade for most salaried employees under the Classification Act and a 40-percent range for the lower levels of the postal field service. This is comparable to the private industry ranges, which vary between 30 and 50 percent for each position. The pay ranges in the lower levels of the postal field service are somewhat broader than those in the Classification Act, in recognition of the pattern of long service in such positions in the postal field service and the need for incentives for sustained performance during the entire period of service.

ANNUAL REVIEW

To maintain the comparability principle, and to assure that other features are improved with experience, the bill provides that the President shall submit an annual report to Congress on the relationship of Federal salaries to those reported by the BLS for private enterprise, recommending whatever adjustments in salary schedules, structure, and policy he finds advisable. Where adjustments are indicated, they would be accomplished by revision of the Classification Act pay scales and by linkage of the other statutory systems to the Classification Act. A systematic annual review of this kind is essential to prevent Federal salary schedules from lapsing to their present conditions.

THE UPPER GRADES

Reform of the existing pay schedules necessarily involves immediate adjustment of salaries at almost all grade levels. But both our experience in the attrition of higher salaried men and women and all objective surveys have disclosed that the gap between private industry salaries and Government salaries is the widest at the upper levels. For example: the most recent Bureau of Labor Statistics survey shows that GS-14 and GS-15 employees receive 20 percent less than those employees in private industry in comparable positions. A 1960 survey of 21 large companies by the Civil Service Commission showed even more startling disparities at higher levels. Employees in these companies performing functions comparable to those of a GS-18 received twice as high a salary as their Federal Government employed counterpart.

Yet these are the very levels in the career service in which our need for quality is most acute—in which keen judgment, experience, and competence are at a premium. It is here that we face our most difficult personnel problems. It is at these grades that we employ our top scientists, doctors, engineers, experts, and managers. Surely if so many State and city governments, as earlier cited, are willing to compete with private industry for this talent, the

Federal Government, with its urgent missions to perform, can face up to this problem as well. As a practical matter, the full principle of comparability cannot be applied to the higher salary levels of government; but I consider adequate adjustment in our top executive and professional positions to be the most vital single element of correction in this entire proposal.

This reform of top career salaries will, of course, boost the pay of many civil servants to a level above that paid to their chiefs in Cabinet, sub-Cabinet and similar positions. I recognize, however, that the salary level of these top executives has been quite properly related in recent years with the salary level of the Congress; and while both are, in my opinion, inadequate, it is neither customary nor appropriate to either provide such increases during current terms of office or specify congressional increases in a Presidential message. Representatives of the executive branch stand ready, however, to cooperate with the Congress in determining what executive and congressional pay scales would be appropriate following the terms of the present incumbents.

TIMING AND COST

It is important for the Federal Government to adhere to its own precepts with respect to pay adjustments in the economy as a whole. Because of the salary lag that has developed over the past 17 years, full correction of the accrued inequities in 1 year would be unwise, involving the substantial cost of more than \$1 billion. This cost would come at a time when heavy budgetary demands have been placed upon us to meet great national security needs, and when the Government is urging private labor and management to exercise self-restraint to avoid the creation of inflationary pressures. Therefore, to reduce the impact in any one year on the affected \$10 billion Federal payroll, where each 1 percent increase costs \$100 million, the plan that I recommend provides that the full 10 percent be distributed over three annual stages, beginning prospectively on January 1, 1963. The increase scheduled to take effect next year is clearly well within the national average productivity increase (in the private sector) which has taken place since the last Federal pay increase in July of 1960.

The substantial costs necessarily involved in achieving this pay reform make it especially important that these improvements in our pay systems take absolute priority over general percentage or dollar increases of the kind we have seen in the past—increases which make little if any contribution to efficiency or economy in Government.

CONCLUSION

As I stated in my budget message, the first requirement for efficiency and economy in Government is highly competent personnel. I believe that enactment of this plan for sound salary administration is fundamental to the maintenance of a standard of excellence in the Federal service. It is my belief that this measure, if enacted, will constitute the most important revision and reform in

Federal personnel legislation in more than a decade. It is the most important proposal to improve the Federal service which has been presented by this administration; and I believe it is essential if we are to achieve and maintain proficiency in the Federal Government. If our civil servants are to fulfill with skill and devotion their obligations to the Nation, the Nation must fulfill its obligations to the career service.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 20, 1962.

COLONEL GLENN'S ORBITAL FLIGHT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, along with the Vice President, yourself, the majority leader, and others, I was present in the White House this morning at the blastoff of Colonel Glenn in his spaceship now circling our earth. It was significant that you, sir, and the Vice President should be present, because it was the vision of both of you which created the two congressional committees which have been responsible for this magnificent program.

The marvel of the thing and the bravery of the man, Colonel Glenn, were felt throughout the morning breakfast. Each delay caused visible dismay. The President, in company with all of his fellow Americans, reflected the hopes and the aspirations riding with this 20th-century Christopher Columbus. At the time of the blastoff we all stood next to a small portable television set in the White House, and silently asked God to protect this lonely American patriot.

As we watched, the seconds stretched into minutes and the reports came back of success. The telephone rang and the President was on the phone with Cape Canaveral and now he, along with the peace-loving peoples all over our earth, is awaiting the return of Colonel Glenn.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that this is a magnificent tribute to our American free and open society, and a stark contrast to the Communist-closed society where their space operations have been closed in secrecy. In our country we have conducted this great adventure in full view of the entire world over television.

If Colonel Glenn succeeds, and pray God he will, not only will it be a tribute to his intrepid bravery but to the millions and millions of our fellow citizens who made this great journey possible.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to commend the majority whip for the remarks he has just made

and to say that all of us share with him his feelings as he has expressed them. I suppose it goes without saying that I was not at the White House meeting. But on our side the Republican leaders of the Senate and House were meeting here in the Capitol and we ceased our deliberations to watch the blastoff on television.

I must say it is a happy day for all of us.

Col. John Glenn in orbit around the world.

Certainly this is another example of American dedication, know-how, and courage. Also I can properly say that this is the culmination of a long period of preparation in this vast scientific field. It was a long and stirring struggle and every American has a right to be proud today. Certainly, the delays that we have witnessed have been agonizing, but I think essentially they reflect our high regard for human life.

None of us would begrudge the precautions taken nor the delays occasioned by the insistence on this degree of perfection that so far indicates the safe return of Colonel Glenn. In respect to those precautions and those endeavors, none of us would want it otherwise.

I agree with the remarks of the gentleman from Louisiana when he points out that this accomplishment has come about in the complete and full presence of all the peoples of the world. Likewise do I agree with him that the flight is in significant contrast with the Soviet flights which have been shrouded in secrecy as they have gone along. If the world ever had a glowing example of the basic difference between freedom and communism, it had it today. I do not know whether the Russians were afraid of possible failure before the eyes of the world or not. If they were, then it is a sign of an inherent weakness that I say does not characterize our efforts in this direction. We have made no attempt to hide anything; rather has the whole world been informed of our progress and now of our accomplishment. I say it is a symbol, and a good one, of the strength and the faith that characterizes our great land and our system. I say Godspeed Colonel Glenn as he circles the earth, and God grant that he shall be brought safely back among us.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great pride I take the floor today, in behalf of the Ohio delegation, to join in the tributes which have been paid, and are being paid, to Colonel Glenn of the Marine Corps, who is now performing one of the great feats of our modern age, because, as most of you know, both Colonel Glenn and his good wife are fellow Ohioans; both reared in a small town in southeastern Ohio, New Concord; where they were childhood and high school sweethearts. Both of them come from pioneer families, have real religious convictions, true patriotism, and great courage. I apply these words to the colonel's good wife as well as to himself,

because these weeks have been, I know, a trial and a burden to her as well as to her courageous husband.

So, all Ohio joins with the rest of the Nation in paying tribute to a great Ohioan, and to his good wife, a great Ohio woman, for that which is happening today. From all over the old Buckeye State there are going up at this moment prayers to Almighty God, as prayers are going up elsewhere throughout the Nation, that Colonel Glenn's adventure shall be culminated by success, and that before the day is out, he will have blazed the way as a new pioneer in space, to again put his beloved country in the lead in space exploration and related activities.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the other Members of this body in extending my congratulations not only to Colonel Glenn, but the many American scientists and technicians that have made this first orbital flight possible. As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics—perhaps better known as the House Space Committee—I have become most acutely aware of the teamwork that is necessary on a project of this type.

The House Space Committee was established July 21, 1958, and since that time a great deal of effort and a great number of dedicated people have contributed much to this program. A good example of this planning and effort can be realized by the knowledge that the initial booster used today in Colonel Glenn's flight was an Army Atlas. This type of missile has been operational for some time, and as is generally known that in an unmodified form exists in large numbers in the hardware stockpiles of our Nation, to provide for our Nation's defenses.

Such programs require painstaking preparation—many thousands—perhaps millions of separate and distinct tests. Sometimes I imagine that the public gets rather impatient with the time involved with these many tests—but please believe me when I say that much delay has resulted from a great desire for the safety of our astronauts.

One thing that delights me personally is that this gives a new viewpoint of the American scientific posture. Many have tended to scoff at our scientific prowess—and tended to hold that we were a second-class nation—in scientific knowledge. But I would like to point out that in the space of a very few years—we have made scientific gains that could not have been achieved by any other nation on earth. It speaks well for our education system—and denies the claims that we lag badly in the production of scientific personnel.

At this juncture—I join with all Members of this body in offering my prayers and hopes for a successful conclusion of the flight.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with other Members who have praised so highly the orbital flight of Colonel Glenn. As a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, I have had the opportunity to observe some of the excellent teamwork that goes into a successful flight of this kind. Our congratulations go out to Colonel Glenn and his astronaut team who made this flight possible, to NASA, the armed services of this country, and all those who played a part in this undertaking. Congratulations are also in order for the committees of the House which played a part in the legislative backing of this program. It points up the fact that both the Eisenhower and Kennedy administration, along with the American public have realized the importance of our race toward the conquest of outer space.

Starting early in the 1950's, this Nation has steadily picked up its tempo in development in this field. This successful undertaking represents the fruition of all of this effort.

The orbital flight of Lieutenant Colonel Glenn today constitutes a major breakthrough in our space program and one in which all of us can take pride. But Americans like to be first. And the fact that today's manned orbital flight had been successfully accomplished on two separate occasions by Russian cosmonauts serves to emphasize the nature of our space competition with the enemy. We have every right to be proud of today's accomplishment. At the same time, as realists, we must understand that our space challenge to the Russians is just beginning. There is a long way to go. We hope that the way will be made easier by the inspiration of frequent breakthroughs such as the one to which our Nation and the free world can point with pride today.

Our hearts and prayers go out to Colonel Glenn and his family for his safe return from a great achievement.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues here today to pay tribute to Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., and the Freedom 7 flight. What is occurring is so epoch making that it is difficult to express with any adequacy our feelings at this moment. This is a time for guarded satisfaction, humility, and prayerful gratitude.

Stated in its most simple terms, all Americans are extremely proud of John Glenn. I am sure that the Members of the House will understand the very special pride which I share with southeastern Ohioans this afternoon that this brave man now circling our planet was

born and raised in the 15th Congressional District of Ohio which I have the honor to represent here.

It is a rare and awesome occasion that we are observing. One solitary man supported by the resources of this Nation as well as by the hopes and prayers of the American people and the peoples of virtually all of the world is now blazing a trail across the skies. His feat is open to our view as each detail unfolds.

The special place John Glenn has won in our hearts and in the bright pages of human history is evident to us all. We shall not relax until he has safely returned from his historic mission. But as the flight progresses, we stand in awe of his achievement, personifying as it does his own dedication and that of others who are opening a new uncharted age for mankind.

DALE WRIGHT AND MICHAEL MOK RECIPIENTS OF 1961 HEYWOOD BROUN AWARD

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the 1961 Heywood Broun Award was bestowed by the American Newspaper Guild upon Dale Wright and Michael Mok, two top-ranked reporters for the New York World-Telegram and Sun. The honor was richly deserved.

Dale Wright's award was for his excellent series of articles on the migrant laborer. Michael Mok's was for an equally fine series on mental hospitals.

Both Dale Wright and Michael Mok are crusading reporters who experienced at first hand the conditions they described. Mr. Wright lived for weeks along the Atlantic seaboard as a migrant farmworker. Mr. Mok feigned mental illness and spent 8 days and nights in a hospital.

The judges for the 1961 Broun Award were Richard Stroud, of the Christian Science Monitor; Henry Brandon, Washington correspondent for the Sunday Times of London, and Herbert Corn, former managing editor of the Washington Star.

The judges said:

We feel that Heywood Broun would feel pride in having his name associated with the two winners of the 1961 award. Both showed concern for the underdog. Both series showed extensive personal research, first-rate writing and initiative.

Many of my colleagues in this House have, I am sure, read the Dale Wright series on the "Forgotten People" which resulted in this award, for I had the pleasure of having these articles inserted in the Record during January of this year. I have introduced a series of bills to deal with the serious and complex problems of the migrant laborers. I certainly hope that Congress will act this session to protect this forgotten segment of our population.

In addition to the award to the reporters, it was announced that a citation would go to the New York World-Telegram and Sun itself. This great newspaper is entitled to our commendation for having encouraged these men to engage in such excellent investigative reporting.

I hope that the Heywood Broun Award will serve to focus greater attention on these unresolved social issues facing America.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

MIN-SUN CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 316) for the relief of Min-sun Chen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GIUSEPPE ANIELLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1352) for the relief of Giuseppe Aniello.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Giuseppe Aniello may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: *Provided,* That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHOW CHUI HA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1934) for the relief of Mrs. Chow Chui Ha.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

MAJ. LEONARD H. POTTERBAUM, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9059) for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Major Leonard H. Potterbaum, 35382A, United States Air Force, Box 7235, Area B, Aerospace Systems Division, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio, the sum of \$5,777.93 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects destroyed as a result of a fire on December 4, 1956, at the National Movers Company, Incorporated, East Rutherford, New Jersey, while the property was stored in a warehouse under a Government contract: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STANLEY HAYMAN & CO., INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1288) for the relief of Stanley Hayman & Co., Inc.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the one-year limitation of time provided by section 140(a) of the District of Columbia Sales Tax Act (D.C. Code 47-2617(a)) is hereby waived in favor of Stanley Hayman and Company, Incorporated, of Washington, District of Columbia, with respect to its applications for refund of sales taxes paid by it during the calendar years 1954 through 1956, if such applications are filed within the one-year period which begins on the date of enactment of this Act.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CONTE: On page 1, immediately after the period in line 11 add the following: "The aggregate amount of refunds made under authority of this act shall not exceed \$1,114.50".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FREE IMPORTATION OF STAINED GLASS FOR ST. JOSEPH'S CATHE- DRAL, HARTFORD, CONN., AND FOR THE CHURCH OF ST. FRANCIS XAVIER, OF PHOENIX, ARIZ.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7431) to allow the importation free of duty of certain stained glass windows for use in St. Joseph's Cathedral, Hartford, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

COL. SAMUEL HALE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 67) for the relief of Col. Samuel Hale.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Colonel Samuel Hale, 4534A, United States Air Force, is relieved of liability to the United States for the payment of so much of the aggregate amount of a loss of funds in his class B agent account that occurred during the period beginning on January 1, 1955, and ending on June 30, 1956, as has not been received by the United States before the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A1C. PERCY J. TRUDEAU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 429) for the relief of A1c. Percy J. Trudeau.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Airman First Class Percy J. Trudeau, the sum of \$260, in full settlement of his claim against the United States for reimbursement of expenses incurred by him in moving his house trailer in connection with a transfer which he made pursuant to orders of December 4, 1958, from Hamilton Air Force Base, California, to Fitzsimons Army Hospital, Denver, Colorado: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES J. UTTERBACK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 521) for the relief of Charles J. Utterback.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles J. Utterback, of Alea, Hawaii, a sum equal to the amount he would have received

as compensation had he continued in his employment with the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army, Honolulu District, from September 30, 1959, the date of his separation from service for the purpose of retirement under the Civil Service Retirement Act (in accordance with an erroneous computation of his term of service made by the Corps of Engineers) through October 12, 1959, the date on which he became eligible for retirement.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SULZBACH CONSTRUCTION CO.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1348) for the relief of the Sulzbach Construction Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Sulzbach Construction Company, of Sioux City, Iowa, the sum of \$48,581.71. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the Sulzbach Construction Company against the United States, remaining unpaid, for certain additional amounts due on account of work performed under its contract with the Air Defense Command (dated July 3, 1958) for site preparation and construction of offsite utilities in connection with the two hundred and thirty-five unit family housing project built under title VIII of the National Housing Act at Sioux City Air Force Base, Iowa. The necessity for payment of additional amounts under the contract arose because of unforeseen expenses resulting from changed conditions during performance, and such payment was approved by the Armed Forces Board of Contract Appeals, but such payment could not be made in full on account of the statutory per-unit ceiling contained in section 505 of the Act of September 28, 1951: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM BURNICE JOYNER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1348) for the relief of William Burnice Joyner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act providing for the barring of claims against the United States", approved October 9, 1940 (31 U.S.C. 71a), are hereby waived in favor of William Burnice Joyner, of Palatka, Florida, if his claim for retroactive adjustment of compensation for services rendered the United States Post Office, Palatka, Florida,

during the period September 1, 1946, to and including September 1, 1948, is filed with the General Accounting Office within one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS JANIS AND CERTAIN OTHER INDIANS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1615) for the relief of Francis Janis and certain other Indians.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following Indians are respectively relieved of liability to the United States in the amounts set opposite their names:

Francis Janis, \$450; Arthur Pat Janis, \$380; Isaac Brave Eagle, \$720; Donald Leroy Little, \$720; Thomas Big Owl, \$360; Charles Thunder Hawk, \$360; Benjamin White Face, \$360; Morris Eugene Kills Back, \$360; Jackson One Feather, \$720; Wallace Henry Little, \$720; Betty Ann Merrill, \$180; Paul Stands, \$180; Theodore Kills Ree, \$180; Ralph Ghost Dog, Senior, \$360; Garvard Good Plume, \$180; Eldred O. Brave Eagle, \$180; Wallace Red Shirt, \$180; Calvin W. Fast Wolf, \$180; Lawrence O. Cross, \$180; Gerald One Feather, \$180; Maurice One Feather, \$180; Edward E. Two Bulls, \$180; Kenneth J. Short Bull, \$180; Benton Rowland, Junior, \$180; Eugene Rowland, \$180; Paul J. Little, \$180; David Bald Eagle, \$180; Augustine Gus Knox, \$1,080; Norman L. Knox, \$180; Donald R. Knox, \$180; Alexander E. Swalley, \$180; George Brave, \$360. Such amounts were advanced by the Department of State in 1958 to pay for the transportation of the persons named and members of their families to the United States from the World's Fair at Brussels, Belgium, where they were stranded when the organization which brought them there to take part in an exhibit, and which was obligated to return them to the United States, became insolvent. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6: Strike "\$380" and insert "\$360".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIOLA BORWICK WARBIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1697) for the relief of Viola Borwick Warbis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Viola Borwick Warbis of Riverside, California, the mother of the late Private Merlin W. Borwick, Junior (US 56147735), who was killed in Korea on November 2, 1951, the sum of \$5,000, representing the amount she would have received as beneficiary of a

civilian life insurance policy issued to the said Merlin W. Borwick, Junior, if such policy had not lapsed prior to his death because of a mistake which resulted in the cancellation by the United States Army of a class E allotment authorized by him for payment of the monthly premiums on such policy.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end thereof add the following: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILDRED LOVE HAYLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2839) for the relief of Mildred Love Hayley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mildred Love Hayley, the widow of Major Frank D. Hayley, United States Air Force, the sum of \$42,450.17 in full settlement of the unpaid balance of all claims against the United States of the dependents of the said Major Frank D. Hayley for periods before February 1, 1961, arising out of the death of the said Major Frank D. Hayley. The payment of such sum represents the difference between the amounts payable to the said Mildred Love Hayley pursuant to the Act of July 15, 1939 (53 Stat. 1042) for herself and her minor children and the amounts actually received by her under other laws of the United States for periods before February 1, 1961: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert: "That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the Act entitled 'An Act to provide for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes,' approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U.S.C. 765-770), are hereby waived in favor of Mildred Love Hayley, the widow of Major Frank D. Hayley, and her claim based on the death of the said Major Frank D. Hayley for compensation under that Act is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of the Act, as amended, if she files such

claim with the Department of Labor (Bureau of Employees' Compensation) not later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided, That no benefits except hospital and medical expenses actually incurred shall accrue for any period of time prior to the date of enactment of this Act: And provided further, That the said Mildred Love Hayley may elect to claim benefits as authorized by this Act without regard to the restrictions of section 416(b) of title 38, United States Code."*

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERTRUDE M. KAPLAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3696) for the relief of Gertrude M. Kaplan. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,315.85 to Mrs. Gertrude M. Kaplan, 60 Lovett Avenue, Little Silver, New Jersey, in full settlement of her claim against the United States as the widow of the late Major Benjamin Kaplan, United States Army, retired, for the balance of retirement benefits erroneously withheld from him in the period from June 16, 1947, to January 21, 1948: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "\$1,315.85" and insert "\$1,227.16".

Page 1, line 10, strike "June 16, 1947" and insert "August 1, 1947".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAPT. H. A. ROWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6075) for the relief of Capt. H. A. Rowe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Captain H. A. Rowe (service number 78775), of the United States Navy, the sum of \$12,991.51, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States arising out of the destruction by fire of his personal property after the United States Army had erroneously shipped such property to Fort Huachuca, Arizona, and placed it in storage there: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof

shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$12,991.54" and insert "\$3,272.08".

Page 2, line 1, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CECIL D. ROSE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6464) for the relief of Cecil D. Rose.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Cecil D. Rose, staff sergeant, United States Army (service number RA 6553668), Fort Lewis, Washington, the sum of \$1,620. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Cecil D. Rose against the United States for reimbursement of money which he was compelled to pay to the United States because his class E allotment payments had been erroneously continued through May 31, 1948, after he had authorized discontinuance of such payments as of March 1, 1946: Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike "staff sergeant" and insert "master specialist (E-7)".

Page 1, line 6, after "Army" insert ", retired,".

Page 2, line 4, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEOFILO ESTOESTA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6740) for the relief of Teofilo Estoesta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the limitation contained in section 2(b) of Public Law 217, Eighty-fifth

Congress, approved August 29, 1957, or any other limiting statute, the claim of Teofilo Estoesta, Army serial 10304217, for pay and allowances due him from December 1, 1941, until date of discharge March 22, 1945, shall be regarded as having been timely filed and may be considered and paid in accordance with other applicable provisions of law.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6: After the word "serial" insert "No."

Page 1, lines 7 and 8: Strike "December 1, 1940, until date of discharge" and insert "April 1, 1943, to November 30, 1943, and February 1, 1944, to".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUANNA L. LEIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7671) for the relief of Louanna L. Leis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louanna L. Leis, Waukegan, Illinois, the sum of \$150.79, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for reimbursement of the amount paid by her in good faith to a member of the Armed Forces upon his discharge from such forces on February 11, 1960, while she was performing her regular duties as agent cashier at the United States Navy Accounts Disbursing Office, Great Lakes, Illinois. On May 26, 1960, at the request of the disbursing officer in whose account the deficiency was created, the said Louanna L. Leis paid to the United States the sum of \$150.79 to clear such deficiency from his account: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out the words "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHYUNG SANG BAK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7704) for the relief of Chyung Sang Bak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the time limitations of section 2734 of title 10 of the United States

Code, or the provisions of former section 324d of title 31 of the United States Code (55 Stat. 880, as amended), or of any other statute of limitation, the claim of Chyung Sang Bak, numbered 57-2, railroad residence numbered 92, Chorang Dong, Third Dong, Pusan, Korea, filed on or about December 5, 1960, shall be held and considered to have been timely filed and the claim of the said Chyung Sang Bak for the disabling injuries he sustained on or about May 28, 1951, shall be considered and, if found meritorious, settled and paid in accordance with otherwise applicable provisions of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. GERALD BEAVER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7708) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver, of Queen City, Texas, jointly, the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Mr. and Mrs. Gerald Beaver against the United States arising out of the accidental death of their infant child during May 1950, in the Fifteenth Evacuation Hospital in Nuremberg, Germany: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, lines 10 and 11, strike "Nuremberg" and insert "Nurnberg".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RONALD L. MUTTER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8195) for the relief of Ronald L. Mutter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ronald L. Mutter of Pontiac, Michigan, the sum of \$342.29, such amount representing reimbursement to said Ronald L. Mutter for paying out of his funds a judgment rendered against him in the courts of the State of Michigan, arising out of an accident which occurred May 8, 1959, when he was operating a Post Office Department vehicle in the course of his duties as an employee of the Post Office Department.

With the following committee amendments.

Page 1, line 8: After the word "judgment" insert "and costs".

Page 1, at end; add "*Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. EUGENE CONGRESS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8368) for the relief of A. Eugene Congress.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to place A. Eugene Congress, a civil engineer employee, grade GS-13, in the Department of the Navy, effective August 25, 1958, in the maximum scheduled salary step of grade GS-13 of the Classification Act of 1949, to which step he would have been entitled if he had not been assigned to duty outside the United States between May 10, 1956, and August 25, 1958.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Navy is authorized and directed to pay A. Eugene Congress an amount equal to the difference in the compensation which the said A. Eugene Congress actually received from and after August 25, 1958, and the compensation which he would have received if he had been in the maximum scheduled salary step for grade GS-13 of the Classification Act of 1949 since that date.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL J. PERICLE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8482) for the relief of Paul J. Pericle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul J. Pericle, of Stockton, California the sum of \$538.47. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Paul J. Pericle against the United States for reimbursement for travel of his dependents from Stockton, California, to Washington, District of Columbia, during March and April 1952, and from Washington, District of Columbia, to Stockton, California, in June 1952, while he was serving in the United States Naval Reserve: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating

the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES R. BANKS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8515) for the relief of James R. Banks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That James R. Banks, Madison, Wisconsin, a civilian employee of the Department of the Air Force, is hereby relieved of all liability to refund to the United States the sum of \$974.40 which is the aggregate amount of the overpayments of salary received by him from the United States as a result of his appointment on January 3, 1960, in violation of section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (Public Law 253, Eighty-second Congress), as amended (5 U.S.C. 43, note), to the position of air traffic control specialist (general), 30th Air Division, Traux Field, Madison, Wisconsin, in grade GS-13 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, by administrative error and without fault or knowledge on his part. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said James R. Banks all sums which may have been paid by him, or withheld from amounts otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of his liability to the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 2, strike out "Traux" and insert "Truax".

Page 2, lines 15 and 16, strike out "in excess of 10 per centum thereof".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH A. TEDESCO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8628) for the relief of Joseph A. Tedesco.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Joseph A. Tedesco, of Niagara Falls, New York, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States for pay and allowances

for excess leave used while on active duty with the United States Army for the period from July 17, 1957, to February 5, 1959, in the amount of \$303.87.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Joseph A. Tedesco, the sum of any amounts received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$303.87" and insert "\$307.87".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RHEA G. BURGESS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9060) for the relief of Rhea G. Burgess.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Mrs. Rhea G. Burgess, Dayton, Ohio, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States a sum of \$373.97, which was erroneously paid to her by the Department of the Air Force for annual leave.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, any amounts refunded by reason of the liability referred to in section 1 of this Act by the said Rhea G. Burgess, or any amounts withheld by the United States from money otherwise due her. In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, full credit shall be given for the amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THEODORE A. ANDERSON

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9188) to relieve Theodore A. Anderson from loss of agricultural conservation program benefits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the payments under the 1960 agricultural conservation program to Theodore A. Anderson of Rio Vista, California, authorized under section 8 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for the construction of a dam, the rolling and crushing of brush, and range reseeding, on Bureau of Land Management land leased by Mr. Anderson in Fresno County, California, shall not be denied or required to be refunded on account of the Federal ownership of the land on which the practices were carried out.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DANIEL E. MOORE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9596) for the relief of Daniel E. Moore.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Daniel E. Moore the sum of \$100 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of certain personal property taken by armed soldiers from his residence during the Battle of Vientiane in December 1960, where he was serving as Public Affairs Officer, United States Information Agency: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES N. TULL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9597) for the relief of James N. Tull.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James N. Tull the sum of \$597.47 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for the loss of certain personal property taken by armed soldiers from his residence during the Battle of Vientiane in December 1960, where he was serving as Deputy Public Affairs Officer, United States Information Agency: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN B. HOGAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9830) for the relief of John B. Hogan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That John B. Hogan, of Alexandria, Virginia, an employee of the Federal Aviation Agency, is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States the sum of \$1,345.72, representing travel and transportation expenses

incurred by the said John B. Hogan in traveling with his dependents from San Francisco, California, to Honolulu, Hawaii, and transportation of household goods from Anchorage, Alaska, to Honolulu, Hawaii, pursuant to travel order numbered FSS56-600 issued by the General Services Administration on June 6, 1956, in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946, as amended, and the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to grant the said relief.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HEIRS AND DEVISEES OF FLY AND HER GROWTH, DECEASED LOWER BRULE INDIAN ALLOTTEES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 9831) to provide relief for the heirs and devisees of Fly and Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottees.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, number 267, the sum of \$1,289.96 for distribution to the persons entitled thereto.

Sec. 2. The heir and devisees, immediate and remote, of Fly, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, number 266, are hereby relieved of all liability to reimburse the United States for any payments erroneously made to them representing revenues from the allotment of Her Growth, deceased Lower Brule Indian allottee, number 267.

With the following committee amendment:

Add at the end thereof: "Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ELFRIEDE PRISCHL ROGERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1451) for the relief of Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (3) and (4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Elfriede Prischl Rogers may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: Provided, That, unless the beneficiary is entitled to care un-

der the Dependents Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250), a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the Immigration and Nationality Act: *Provided further, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.*

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 9, after the word "under", strike out "the Dependents' Medical Care Act (70 Stat. 250)," and substitute in lieu thereof "chapter 55 of title 10 of the United States Code."

On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "this exemption" and substitute in lieu thereof the words "these exemptions".

On page 2, line 2, strike out the words "a ground" and substitute the word "grounds".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDVIGE CIANCILLI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1671) for the relief of Edvige Cianciulli.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Edvige Cianciulli shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Edvige Cianciulli. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Edvige Cianciulli shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. VARTANUS UZAR

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6082) for the relief of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Vartanus Uzar shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That, the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Mrs. Vartanus Uzar. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Mrs. Vartanus Uzar shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ATHANASIA DEKAZOS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6276) for the relief of Athanasia Dekazos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Athanasia Dekazos, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Doctor and Mrs. Frank J. Charvat, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ISABEL A. MIGUEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6343) for the relief of Mrs. Isabel A. Miguel.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mrs. Isabel A. Miguel may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that Act: Provided, That this exemption shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, at the end of the bill, change the period to a colon and add the

following: "Provided further, That a suitable and proper bond or undertaking, approved by the Attorney General, be deposited as prescribed by section 213 of the said Act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELISABETTA MARCHEGIANI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 7777) for the relief of Elisabetta Marchegiani.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Elisabetta Marchegiani, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Peter Piccioni, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents of the beneficiary shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 5, strike out the name "Elisabetta Marchegiani" and substitute in lieu thereof the name "Elisabetta Piccioni."

Amend the title so as to read: "For the relief of Elisabetta Piccioni."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An Act for the relief of Elisabetta Piccioni."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EVAGELOS MABLEKOS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 235) for the relief of Evangelos Mablekos.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (19) of section 212(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Evangelos Mablekos may be issued an immigrant visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such Act: Provided, That this Act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion under such paragraph known to the Secretary of State or the Attorney General prior to the date of the enactment of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARALAMBOS AGOURAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 241) for the relief of Haralambos Agourakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk called the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Haralambos Agourakis shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of John William and Effie Parashos, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EUGENIA CHRZASTOWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 531) for the relief of Eugenia Chrzastowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Eugenia Chrzastowski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NANCIE ELLEN WILLIAMSON

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1076) for the relief of Nancie Ellen Williamson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Nancie Ellen Williamson, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Percy Williamson, citizens of the United States: Provided, That no natural parent of Nancie Ellen Williamson by virtue of such parentage, shall be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

YASUKO OTSU

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1560) for the relief of Yasuko Otsu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Yasuko Otsu, the fiancée of Ralph Allen Spellman, a citizen of the United States, shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a

period of three months, if the administrative authorities find (1) that the said Yasuko Otsu, is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of being married to the said Ralph Allen Spellman and (2) that she is otherwise admissible under the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons does not occur within three months after the entry of the said Yasuko Otsu she shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported in accordance with the provisions of sections 242 and 243 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. In the event the marriage between the above-named persons shall occur within three months after the entry of the said Yasuko Otsu the Attorney General is authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of the said Yasuko Otsu as of the date of the payment by her of the required visa fee.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIGITTE MARIE IDA KROLL

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1685) for the relief of Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the periods of time Brigitte Marie Ida Kroll has resided in the United States since her admission as a lawful permanent resident on May 23, 1953, shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act, and the petition for naturalization may be filed with any court having naturalization jurisdiction.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCES E. SARCONI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1776) for the relief of Frances E. Sarcone.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Frances E. Sarcone shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 18, 1951.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. TZY-CHENG PENG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1791) for the relief of Dr. Tzy-cheng Peng.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Tzy-cheng Peng shall be held and considered to have been law-

fully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of September 26, 1952, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. ALFIA ALESSANDRO MILANA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1793) for the relief of Mrs. Alfia Alessandro.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be re-committed to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

SUSANNE RAE DEREMO

The Clerk call the bill (S. 1832) for the relief of Susanne Rae Deremo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of sections 101(a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Susanne Rae Deremo, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Charles E. Deremo and Elene Deremo, citizens of the United States: Provided, That the natural parents of the said Susanne Rae Deremo shall not, by virtue of such parentage, be accorded any right, privilege, or status under the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. BERCHEMANS RIOUX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1866) for the relief of Dr. Berchemans Rioux.

There being no objection the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Doctor Berchemans Rioux shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of July 14, 1949, and the time he has resided and been physically present in the United States since that date shall be held and considered to meet the residence and physical presence requirements of section 316 of the said Act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUCIA BIANCA CIANTO ROSA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1870) for the relief of Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Lucia Bianca Cianto Rosa shall be deemed to be within the purview of section 4 of Public Law 86-383, the Act of September 22, 1959.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HUGO KOLBERG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2149) for the relief of Hugo Kolberg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Hugo Kolberg, a naturalized citizen of the United States, shall be held not to lose nor to have lost his United States citizenship under section 352(a) (1) of such Act by residing in Germany: Provided, That he returns to the United States for permanent residence prior to September 1, 1964.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAIFOOK CHAN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2163) for the relief of Saifook Chan. There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of the proviso to section 201(a) shall not be applicable in the case of Saifook Chan, a native of Malaya.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DOCTOR HAU CHEONG KWAAN AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2385) for the relief of Doctor Hau Cheong Kwaan, his wife Tech Phaik Loui Kwaan, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the provisions of the proviso contained in section 201(a), and the provisions of sections 202(a) (5) and 202(b) shall be deemed not to be applicable in the cases of Doctor Hau Cheong Kwaan, a native of the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong, his wife, Tech Phaik Loui Kwaan, a native of Malaya, and their daughter, Laura Wai Man Kwaan, a native of the British Crown Colony of Hong Kong.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and

passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOHAN SINGH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2684) for the relief of Mohan Singh.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Mohan Singh shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KEVORK TOROIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5652) for the relief of Kevork Tororian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, For the purposes of section 4 of the Act of September 22, 1959, the petition approved in behalf of Kevork Tororian, on October 22, 1959, shall be deemed to have been approved prior to January 1, 1959.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 6, at the end of the bill, strike out the period and add the following: ", and the provisions of section 24(a) (7) of the Act of September 26, 1961 (75 Stat. 657), shall not be applicable in this case."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER M. THEOPHANE (JANE CARROLL)

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8422) for the relief of Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll), who lost United States citizenship under the provisions of section 349(a) (5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, may be naturalized by taking prior to one year after the effective date of this Act, before any court referred to in subsection (a) of section 310 of the Immigration and Nationality Act or before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States abroad, the oaths prescribed by section 337 of the said Act. From and after naturalization under this Act, the said Sister M. Theophane (Jane Carroll) shall have the

same citizenship status as that which existed immediately prior to its loss.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FONG KAI DONG

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1588) for the relief of Fong Kai Dong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Fong Kai Dong shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this Act, upon payment of the required visa fee. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bond, which may have issued in the case of Fong Kai Dong. From and after the date of the enactment of this Act, the said Fong Kai Dong shall not again be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants and orders have issued."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIN-SUN CHEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 316) for the relief of Min-sun Chen.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill S. 316, Calendar No. 287, be recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 549) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10050) to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally

divided and controlled by the Chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment shall be in order to said bill except amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means. Amendments offered by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means may be offered to the bill at the conclusion of the general debate, but said amendments shall not be subject to amendment. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I will yield one-half of my time, or 30 minutes, to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 16]

Anfuso	Hollifield	Powell
Bass, N.H.	Huddleston	Rains
Bass, Tenn.	Jones, Ala.	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Mich.	Kirwan	Riehlman
Bray	Kitchin	Roosevelt
Broomfield	Loser	Rousslet
Cooley	McFall	Scherer
Dooley	Marrow	Shelley
Fulton	Miller, Clem	Shipley
Gubser	Miller,	Sisk
Hagen, Calif.	George P.	Spence
Hansen	Miller, N.Y.	Stratton
Harding	Monagan	Teague, Tex.
Harrison, Va.	Moss	Thompson, N.J.
Hays	Moulder	Tollefson
Hébert	O'Hara, Mich.	Tupper
Hoffman, Mich.	O'Konski	Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 384 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. O'NEILL] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 549 provides for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10050, to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The resolution is a closed rule providing 3 hours of general debate on H.R. 10050, which provides for a temporary addition of \$2 billion in the debt limit for the fiscal year 1962.

The present permanent statutory debt limit is \$285 billion. In recent years, however, temporary 1-year additions to the debt limit have been made. Last year, Congress provided a temporary addition of \$13 billion for the period July 1, 1961, to June 30, 1962. Thus the pres-

ent combined permanent and temporary debt limit of the United States for the fiscal year 1962 is \$298 billion. This bill would increase the temporary statutory debt limit for the remainder of the fiscal year 1962 from \$13 to \$15 billion, which would increase the combined permanent and temporary debt limit from \$298 to \$300 billion.

The bill is recommended by the administration; and, as I understand, is recommended with some restrictions from the Committee on Ways and Means. The evidence before the Rules Committee showed that the working fund in the Federal Reserve System runs about \$2,500 million a day. This, technically, is not enough money to have the Treasury operate on a sound financial basis; consequently, the Secretary of the Treasury should have more leeway. As a result this bill is asked at the present time to increase the temporary debt limit from \$298 to \$300 billion.

I urge the adoption of House Resolution 549 which would provide a closed rule of 3 hours' general debate.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown].

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts, my colleague on the Rules Committee [Mr. O'NEILL], has explained, this resolution would make in order, under a closed or gag rule which would prohibit the offering or consideration of any amendment except such as might be submitted by the Committee on Ways and Means itself, providing for 3 hours of general debate, with provision for one motion to recommit, either with or without instructions, H.R. 10050, a bill from the Ways and Means Committee for the increase, until June 30 next, of the temporary national debt limit from \$298 billion, the present temporary debt limit, to \$300 billion.

I would like to remind the House, if I may, that only once in the history of this Nation has our national debt limit ever been fixed at \$300 billion. That was during World War II. I want you to understand that the debt increase asked for in this bill is purely a temporary one and would not only add to the present temporary debt limit but be temporary in nature, because all information we have been able to obtain indicates there will be another bill submitted to the Congress, probably in May or June, to again increase the national debt limit above the \$300 billion fixed in this bill. The President, in fact, has requested of the Congress an increase in the national debt limit of \$10 billion, or to increase it from \$298 to \$308 billion. Of course we are told by some the necessity for this continuing deficit financing, and for this present request for increase in the national debt for our great grandchildren to pay someday, if they can, is because of our great defense expenditures and the Berlin situation. We are told at the same time that the deficit at the end of the present fiscal year, 1962, ending on June 30, will be at least \$7 billion and, according to the estimates of some fiscal experts, such as

those on the Finance Committee in the other body, may run as high as \$10 billion.

So this action today will be very temporary in nature, in the hope it may carry over the administration and the Treasury—this extra \$2 billion—until June 30, so that in the meantime we may pass another bill to further increase the national debt limit, so as to permit further borrowing to finance continued deficits in Government operations.

This bill comes out under a closed or a gag rule.

I believe most Members of the House are aware of, and well informed on, the position many of us have taken as to gag or closed rules. It has been customary in most cases to vote for gag rules on bills which come from the Committee on Ways and Means dealing with tax problems, because the argument has been made that otherwise it might open up the entire Internal Revenue Code to any amendment that anyone might wish to introduce. So, usually the House has bound itself by a closed or gag rule. But, as has been stated many times in the well of the House, the other body has no such closed or gag rules, and any amendment may be offered by any Member of that body, and considered if it is germane.

No, this bill does not amend the Internal Revenue Act; instead, it would amend the Second Liberty Bond Act, which simply authorizes the Government to sell more bonds and borrow more money as a result thereof. Of course, the justification is made that perhaps someone might offer an amendment to some other portion of the Second Liberty Bond Act. Well, now, I doubt very much there are many Members of the House who would want to introduce, or would even want to support, any amendment to increase this new borrowing power above the \$2 billion fixed in this bill.

We had an experience here in the House in the last session last summer. We were told that it was impossible to write postal rate legislation on the floor of the House; that it was too complex, and yet the House voted down a closed or gag rule at that time on that bill. And, the postal rate measure was brought up later, in the beginning of this session, under an open rule and, believe it or not, the House of Representatives—while I may not agree with everything done on that bill—was able to work its will, pass and send the bill to the other body where it now rests and is being considered. That, I think, is a good indication that if the House of Representatives is given the opportunity to work its will on almost any type of legislation, it has the good judgment, and certainly the ability, to work out as good and proper legislation as any other legislative body anywhere in the world, whether under the dome of this Capitol or elsewhere. For that reason a great many of us—not quite a majority but pretty close thereto—opposed and voted against the granting of a closed or a gag rule when this measure was before the Committee on Rules.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I still do not understand fully why the request was made by the Ways and Means Committee for a gag rule.

Mr. BROWN. I endeavored to explain that very quickly by saying that the request for the gag rule was made by the committee—as an expression of fear by some members of the Committee on Ways and Means that some other amendments might be offered to the bill. Just what they could be, I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. Would it be too bad if this bill was open to amendments? Would it be too bad if the Members of the House had an opportunity to work their will?

Mr. BROWN. Not that I know of. I have no information that indicates to me it would be a dangerous procedure to permit the House of Representatives, which is supposed to be a very able body, to work its will once in a while on legislative matters, even if it comes from the distinguished Committee on Ways and Means.

Let me say this in conclusion, for I want to be absolutely fair: I do have great admiration, great respect, and really great affection for the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], who came to the Congress a great many years ago at the same time I came here. I realize fully the difficult position he and the Committee on Ways and Means have found themselves in as the result of the request of the President for a \$10 billion increase in borrowing power, and in the national debt limit, and through the presentation of this bill.

I would like to suggest to all of you, if I may—and I know this may be a little bit difficult and perhaps is asking too much of some of my colleagues—but I do believe you will find in the report on this bill a very able and a very well prepared minority report, on separate views, we might call them, of a great many members of this committee. I believe they are worthy of your reading. And, if you check the report carefully, you will find out that with the great increase in spending which has created these deficits which, in turn, has created the demand we raise the debt limit so that we can borrow more money to meet the deficits, most of those expenditures have not been for military or defense purposes but, instead, have been for domestic programs, most of them new domestic programs, which, of course, the Congress, as will be pointed out in debate, voted for too often and too many times—very seldom with my support, I might add. But notwithstanding, the charge is made the Congress voted for them, the pressure for passage came from somewhere else.

The requests for the enactment of these spending programs, and the expenditures of these huge sums of money, which created these deficits, came from the executive branch of the Government. It is economic history, if you please, and it has always been true, that the executive has held down public spending rather than the legislative branch. It is in that executive branch of the Govern-

ment we demand, and need to insist upon, some real statesmanship and real leadership in behalf of economy in meeting the problems of this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the reason I take the time is to try to emphasize further the position of which I approve which has been taken by the minority leader on the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, for many years I have opposed the Ways and Means Committee's bringing other than tax measures out of that committee to the floor of the House under a closed rule. I do not believe it is necessary. I do believe that it prevents the House from working its will. This is an area where certainly we could have an open rule.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to emphasize this point, because during the fight on the so-called liberalization of the Rules Committee—I think some of you may recall that my position was a little different from most of the Members on my side of the aisle—I felt the principle of the party having the responsibility or the authority should have the power of moving forward. But I warned at the time that this looked phony to me and there was no liberalization about this. The one thing I was concerned about was whether the pattern we saw during the thirties, where the Rules Committee was used to bring out closed rules, was not what was really in mind rather than to allow the House to work its will. At the time I pointed out that the Rules Committee could not thwart the will of the majority of the House. The Rules Committee cannot keep measures off the floor of the House. Calendar Wednesday is always available. The procedure is simple. It provides for orderly debate and amendment under the commonly used 5-minute rule. Contrary to the propaganda of those who seek to escape the responsibility for the power of leadership they possess it cannot be impeded by filibustering tactics any more than any other House procedure. Nor can the Rules Committee impose a gag through a closed rule on the House of Representatives. All we have to do is what we did under the postal rate increase bill last year—to vote down the gag rule and then vote up a liberal rule. So, if this is going to be imposed, it is going to be because the majority control by the Democratic Party wants the gag rule and it has no intention of permitting the House to consider matters on the floor of the House which we could consider under the 5-minute rule which Calendar Wednesday provides, or when matters do come to the House with a rule, under an open rule that permits amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AVERY].

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make two very brief points under the consideration of the rule here this afternoon. In the first place, this legislation has been alluded to as a temporary increase in the national debt limitation. Now, I do not think anyone on the floor here this afternoon really believes that

this is a temporary increase. The only thing temporary about it is that it is only supposed to last until June and then we are going to be asked to raise it even more. So, I think when we vote on this later this afternoon, we should bear in mind that this is not temporary to the extent that we are later going to lower it.

It is only temporary to the extent that we are going to raise it again. If we raise it in keeping with the request of the Executive it will be \$8 billion; it may have to be more by June but at this time it looks as though it will be about \$8 billion.

Mr. Speaker, the second point I want to make is this. Yesterday, when the very learned and the very persuasive chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means appeared before the Committee on Rules, he made a statement to this effect—he is on the floor, so if I misquote him, I hope he will correct me. He said if you are opposed to excessive Government spending, a limitation on the national debt ceiling is not the way to contain or to reduce or to control Federal spending. The only time you control Federal spending is, first, at the time a program is authorized, or, second, at the time the appropriation is made. After that particular milestone has been passed, we have a moral obligation, of course, to meet our commitments.

What I want to say is this. I agree with the chairman. Actually, if you are concerned about Government spending, excessive Government spending—and I think everybody is—today is not the day. The test is going to come tomorrow when we have the proposal for a Department of Urban Affairs before the House. That will be the test whether or not you are really concerned about Government spending, because that is the time, according to the chairman—and I fully concur—that we will be authorizing a new Department that, by the very nature of its concept, can only grow, can only assume more jurisdiction, in some cases, perhaps preempt jurisdiction from existing agencies and will require an increasing appropriation as each year goes by.

So today I am going to vote for this increase. The hypocritical or political vote, of course, for me to cast would be against it because I have voted against most of these increases in authorizations for spending. But I am going to vote for it because I feel we do have a moral obligation to meet our commitments. But I am going to be watching tomorrow when we have the proposal before us to create a new Department of Urban Affairs and find out for sure who are those who are not concerned about additional Government spending.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. The reason I asked the gentleman to yield is to clarify a point. I think we are all familiar with the procedures where the House can vote such a closed rule and then proceed, if they so choose, to debate this matter under an open rule. The is-

sue comes on ordering the previous question. At that time I hope that everyone will vote down the motion to order the previous question so we will have an opportunity to proceed under an open rule. That is the gentleman's understanding of the procedure?

Mr. AVERY. That is my understanding. I am sure it can be clarified by way of a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AVERY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. The gentleman surely does not take the position that Members who have opposed these programs time after time are now obligated in any way whatsoever to vote for these increases, as they have not voted for the authorizations?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman that I certainly would be the first to recognize that he has voted against almost every authorization for an increase of Federal responsibility, and has voted against many appropriations. On the other hand, the majority determined the obligation of the Federal Government which committed us to these programs. So I can see no other responsible vote than "aye." I would be very much interested to observe when this vote comes how those who have always voted programs calling for increased expenditures feel about this proposal that calls for an increase in the ceiling on the national debt.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, does he not think that they have the responsibility to vote this increase, instead of those people who have opposed those programs?

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I am not passing judgment on that. I might say that I only said I was going to be very much interested to observe how some will vote on this matter later this afternoon.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Speaker, I have been in the Congress 9 years and every year this bill has always come before us in exactly the same manner, that is, under a closed rule. Only once in the years that I have been a member of the Committee on Rules did we report out an open rule, and before it came to the floor of the House the bill was recalled to the Committee on Rules where we changed our vote and voted out a closed rule.

Mr. Speaker, it has been the custom of the Committee on Ways and Means on bills of this kind to request a closed rule to the House. Why has that been the custom, Mr. Speaker? Because we do not want to open up tax bills and we do not want to open up a bill as highly sensitive as this bill is to the possibility of amendments by 435 Members.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to the gentleman that this is not a tax bill. I have supported reluctantly the theory with reference to a tax bill where you

have to maintain a balance, but this is not a tax bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to call attention to the fact that during the years of the previous administration, we appeared before the Committee on Rules in behalf of temporary increases in the debt ceiling and asked for a closed rule to permit the consideration of this matter. The Committee on Rules provided a closed rule. The House adopted a closed rule. We have followed this procedure ever since I have been a Member of the House.

Mr. Speaker, of course, there are reasons for that procedure. I would think that those who are now complaining, perhaps, about the fact that we have a closed rule do not have in mind the offering of amendments even if the rule were open and, therefore, I do not know what their reason for asking for an open rule would be, if they do not have in mind the offering of amendments.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. First, I might say in response to the gentleman from Arkansas, my good chairman, I think he will recognize that I am maintaining a position that I have tried to maintain in the Committee on Ways and Means, and I would call attention to the fact that the House, unfortunately from my standpoint, has been in control of the Democratic Party during the years that the gentleman mentions. I do not believe there are any amendments that are to be offered so far as I know. My purpose in making this an issue is a very clear one. I think it is about time the Committee on Ways and Means stopped leaning on this weak reed, as it were, the closed rule, and started debating these matters before the House under an open rule which I am satisfied we could follow that procedure. Now I certainly very seriously want to call the attention of the country, the best I can, if this is a device for doing it, and I think it is, this fight over the Rules Committee last year was a phony; it was not to liberalize the procedure and to allow matters to come before the House and to have the House work its will.

First, the House can work its will on Calendar Wednesday on any matter that is reported out by a committee. The matter does not have to go to the Committee on Rules.

Second, if the Committee on Rules does attempt to have closed rules, and that was during the 1930's, it is possible for the House to vote down that kind of procedure. In many respects, I am defending the Committee on Rules against unfair attacks as if it were actually a bottleneck in our House procedure when the real issue is that the Committee on Rules is accurately reflecting the will of the majority of the House and cannot thwart the will of the majority of the

House, and this is a very convenient opportunity to drive home this point, and I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, just for the record, I think it should be said that 2 years ago some 32 of us did ask for the privilege of an open rule in order that we might offer an amendment to the temporary increase in the national debt ceiling then being considered. I would have liked to have had that opportunity at that time, and I would like to have that opportunity at this time. The Committee on Rules in its wisdom, apparently, has felt that on a matter of this sensitivity, the House is not to be regarded as possessing sufficient discernment en masse to make prudent and judicious disposition of this bill under an open rule. I shall not quarrel with that conclusion, if it is a conclusion, beyond saying I would like to offer an amendment which was sponsored by some 32 of us as a group which would have committed the Congress in future years to a systematic plan of annual reductions of the national debt.

For that reason I would go against a closed rule. Beyond this I can recognize the judgment of the Rules Committee and respect its wisdom, but I think it should be said for the record that there are some of us who would like to have the opportunity to present amendments.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I think the membership should note that the Rules Committee in this instance is responding to the request which I made on behalf of the Ways and Means Committee. No one can criticize the Rules Committee because it reports legislation to the House providing for a closed rule when that committee is doing exactly what the membership of the Ways and Means Committee instructed its chairman to ask the Rules Committee to do. They instructed me as chairman and I appeared before the Rules Committee. This decision was made within the Ways and Means Committee.

It is true that my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], has in the past opposed a request of the Ways and Means Committee for a closed rule, but that view of the gentleman from Missouri is not shared within the committee by all of his Republican colleagues on the committee. So this is not a request that we made on the Rules Committee as a result of a vote of the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee; this decision was shared by many of the colleagues of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] on the Ways and Means Committee, just as has been the case in the past when this matter has been before us.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I simply want to confirm the statement of the chairman. What he says is certainly

true, and I did not want to mislead anyone into thinking that I had been able to prevail with a majority of my colleagues on my side of the aisle, but this is an issue that I hope someday will prevail. There is no question, as the chairman stated, that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee requested the chairman to ask for a closed rule.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. AVERY. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not think the matter of a closed rule is the issue. I just want to have the gentleman from Massachusetts enlighten me and the other Members if we would have an open rule what is the worst that could happen? Are there more than three amendments that could be offered to the bill, mainly to change the amount?

Mr. O'NEILL. I think a good many amendments could be offered. There is a great possibility that somebody might want to hamstring Federal borrowing.

There is a possibility that someone might offer an amendment that would destroy the borrowing power of the Secretary of the Treasury; in other words, there could be a limit upon the bill that would hamstring the borrowing of the Secretary of the Treasury; and we cannot allow such a thing to happen as a matter of good housekeeping.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Further answering the inquiry of the gentleman from Kansas as to the type of amendment that would be in order to this bill if an open rule were granted, the rate of interest to be paid on Government bonds could be affected by an amendment. The deposit of Federal funds within Federal Reserve banks could be affected by an amendment to this bill. The time of the issuance of Government securities could be affected within this bill; anything that has to do with the Federal debt which was provided for under the Second Liberty Loan Act would be in order.

Mr. AVERY. Did I understand the gentleman from Arkansas to say that the rate of interest could be considered as germane to amending the Second Liberty Loan Act?

Mr. MILLS. Yes. It is in that act that we have this 4 1/4 percent. In addition you could have amendments affecting open market operations.

Mr. AVERY. Is the gentleman fearful the interest rate might be raised?

Mr. MILLS. I was simply trying to answer the question as to what kind of amendments could be offered. It is not as simple or as free in the offering of amendments as some might think.

Mr. AVERY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. We are dealing with what I consider to be at the moment a very sensitive matter when we talk about the handling of our own obligations and what we might do in the process of passing legislation affecting those obligations and providing for the refinanc-

ing of them as they come due. It is possible that we could take some action—I know none of us would want to do that—that would have a very disturbing effect upon the market value of other bonds as well as these bonds.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Earlier in this debate or colloquy, the gentleman from Arkansas said he knew of no amendments to be offered. I can assure the gentleman if this is opened up I will be happy to offer an amendment to the bill.

Mr. MILLS. I was not referring to the gentleman from Iowa. I was referring to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] who said if it is opened up he had no amendments. I was assuming my good friend from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] had no amendments to offer. They were the ones making the point it should be considered under an open rule, but they had no amendments in mind. That is what I was referring to. I know the gentleman wants to offer an amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I certainly would want to offer an amendment.

Mr. O'NEILL. The Rules Committee is always reluctant to report a closed rule, but in this case it was upon the insistence of the membership of the Ways and Means Committee because of the sensitiveness of the whole matter.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 258, nays 133, answered "present" 1, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 17]

YEAS—258

Abbutt	Byrne, Pa.	Dingell
Addonizio	Byrnes, Wis.	Donohue
Albert	Cahill	Downing
Alexander	Cannon	Doyle
Arends	Carey	Dulski
Ashley	Celler	Dwyer
Aspinall	Chamberlain	Edmondson
Avery	Chelf	Elliott
Baker	Chenoweth	Everett
Baldwin	Clark	Evins
Barrett	Coad	Fallon
Bates	Cohelan	Farbstein
Beckworth	Conte	Fascell
Betts	Cook	Feighan
Blatnik	Corbett	Fenton
Boggs	Corman	Finnegan
Boland	Curtin	Fino
Bolling	Curtis, Mass.	Flood
Bonner	Daddario	Flynt
Boykin	Daniels	Fogarty
Breeding	Davis, John W.	Ford
Brewster	Davis, Tenn.	Fountain
Brooks	Delaney	Frazier
Buckhill	Dent	Friedel
Buckley	Denton	Gallagher
Burke, Ky.	Diggs	Garland

Garmatz	McDowell	Rogers, Colo.
Gary	McFall	Rooney
Gathings	Macdonald	Rostenkowski
Gialmo	Mack	Roush
Gilbert	Madden	Rutherford
Glenn	Mahon	Ryan
Gonzalez	Malhiard	St. Germain
Granahan	Marshall	Santangelo
Grant	Martin, Mass.	Saund
Gray	Mason	Saylor
Green, Oreg.	Mathias	Schneebeli
Green, Pa.	Matthews	Selden
Griffiths	Miller, Clem	Shelley
Hagan, Ga.	Milliken	Sheppard
Hagen, Calif.	Mills	Shipley
Halleck	Moeller	Shriver
Halpern	Montoya	Sikes
Harding	Moorhead, Pa.	Sisk
Hardy	Morgan	Slack
Harris	Morris	Smith, Iowa
Harrison, Va.	Morrison	Smith, Miss.
Harvey, Mich.	Morse	Smith, Va.
Healey	Moss	Spence
Hébert	Multer	Staggers
Hechler	Murphy	Steed
Hemphill	Murray	Stephens
Henderson	Natcher	Stubblefield
Herlong	Nedzi	Sullivan
Hollfield	Nix	Taylor
Holland	Norblad	Teague, Calif.
Ichord, Mo.	Norrell	Teague, Tex.
Inouye	O'Brien, Ill.	Thomas
Jarman	O'Brien, N.Y.	Thompson, La.
Jennings	O'Hara, Ill.	Thompson, Tex.
Joelson	Olsen	Thornberry
Johnson, Calif.	O'Neill	Toll
Johnson, Md.	Osmer	Trimble
Johnson, Wis.	Ostertag	Tuck
Jones, Ala.	Patman	Tupper
Jones, Mo.	Perkins	Udall, Morris K.
Judd	Peterson	Ullman
Karsten	Pfost	Vanik
Karh	Phillips	Van Zandt
Kastenmeier	Pike	Vinson
Kee	Pflicher	Wallhauser
Keith	Poage	Walter
Kelly	Powell	Watts
Keogh	Price	Wels
Kilgore	Pucinski	Westland
King, Calif.	Purcell	Whalley
King, Utah	Quie	Whitener
Kluczyński	Randall	Wickersham
Kornegay	Reece	Widnall
Kowalski	Reuss	Williams
Kunkel	Rhodes, Pa.	Wilson, Calif.
Landrum	Rivers, Alaska	Yates
Lane	Rivers, S.C.	Young
Lankford	Roberts, Ala.	Younger
Lesinski	Roberts, Tex.	Zablocki
Libonati	Rodino	Zelenko

NAYS—133

Abernethy	Dorn	Moore
Adair	Dowdy	Moorehead,
Alford	Durno	Ohio
Alger	Findley	Mosher
Andersen,	Fisher	Nelsen
Minn.	Forrester	Nygaard
Anderson, Ill.	Frelinghuysen	Passman
Andrews	Gavin	Pelly
Ashbrook	Goodell	Pillion
Ashmore	Gooding	Pirnie
Auchincloss	Gross	Poff
Ayres	Haley	Ray
Baring	Hall	Reifel
Barry	Harrison, Wyo.	Robison
Battin	Harsha	Rogers, Fla.
Becker	Harvey, Ind.	Rogers, Tex.
Beermann	Hiestand	Roudebush
Belcher	Hoeven	Russell
Bell	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Bennett, Fla.	Horan	Schadeberg
Berry	Hosmer	Schenck
Blitch	Hull	Scherer
Bolton	Jensen	Schweiker
Bow	Johansen	Schwengel
Brown	Jonas	Scott
Brown	Kearns	Scranton
Bruce	King, N.Y.	Seely-Brown
Burleson	Knox	Short
Casey	Kyl	Slier
Cederberg	Laird	Smith, Calif.
Chilperfield	Langen	Springer
Church	Latta	Stafford
Clancy	Lennon	Taber
Collier	Lipscomb	Thomson, Wis.
Colmer	McCulloch	Tollefson
Cramer	McDonough	Utt
Cunningham	McIntire	Van Pelt
Curtis, Mo.	McMillan	Waggonner
Dague	McSweeney	Weaver
Davis,	McVey	Wharton
James C.	MacGregor	Whitten
Derounian	Martin, Nebr.	Wilson, Ind.
Derwinski	May	Winstead
Devine	Meader	Wright
Dole	Michel	
Dominick	Minshall	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kilburn

NOT VOTING—42

Addabbo	Griffin	Monagan
Anfuso	Gubser	Moulder
Bailey	Hansen	O'Hara, Mich.
Bass, N.H.	Hays	O'Konski
Bass, Tenn.	Hoffman, Mich.	Rains
Bennett, Mich.	Huddleston	Rhodes, Ariz.
Brademas	Kirwan	Riehlman
Bray	Kitchin	Roosevelt
Broomfield	Lindsay	Sibal
Burke, Mass.	Loser	Stratton
Cooley	Magnuson	Thompson, N.J.
Dawson	Marrow	Willis
Dooley	Miller,	
Ellsworth	George P.	
Fulton	Miller, N.Y.	

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Kitchin against.
 Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Moulder against.
 Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. O'Konski against.
 Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Fulton against.
 Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Bray against.
 Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
 Mr. Willis for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Bass of New Hampshire.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Broomfield.
 Mr. O'Hara of Michigan with Mr. Marrow.
 Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Miller of New York.
 Mr. Rains with Mr. Sibal.
 Mr. Bailey with Mr. Dooley.
 Mr. Stratton with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Loser with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Ellsworth.
 Mr. George P. Miller with Mr. Gubser.
 Mr. Bass of Tennessee with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona.

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] who is at Cape Canaveral and, who, if present, would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10050) to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 10050, with Mr. JENNINGS in the chair.

By unanimous consent the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, the bill H.R. 10050 was reported from the Ways and Means Committee after the committee heard the Secretary of the

Treasury and the Deputy Director of the Bureau of the Budget explain to us what the situation is with respect to our potential obligations for the remainder of this fiscal year under legislation which is in existence at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, this bill provides a temporary addition of \$2 billion in the debt limitation in effect for the fiscal year 1962. Presently there is in effect a temporary addition of \$13 billion raising the statutory debt limit from the permanent level of \$285 billion to a temporary level of \$298 billion. This temporary increase is in effect for the balance of the current fiscal year, that is, until June 30.

The present bill which increases the temporary statutory debt limit by \$2 billion will permit the public debt to rise during the balance of the present fiscal year to a level of \$300 billion.

At the present time, we are not recommending any action with respect to the debt limit beyond June 30 of this year. We will not be able to make a useful recommendation on that matter until we know more of the expenditure and revenue outlook. If I may repeat this point, the present bill does not deal at all with the recommendation made by the President for providing a public debt limit of \$308 billion for the fiscal year 1963.

The \$2 billion temporary addition provided in the present bill is required to deal with the immediate financing problems. In setting the debt limitation in the past, we have given particular attention to the Treasury situation at the 15th of each month.

Generally, whatever taxes are due in a particular month are, under present law, due on the 15th or later if the 15th is a weekend. When tax payments are mailed close to the 15th, they may not be covered into the Treasury tax and loan accounts until a few days after the 15th. In any case, we find that during the first 2 weeks of each month expenditures which go on at a regular rate run ahead of receipts and the peak deficit each month is just before the bunched tax collections around the 15th.

In setting an actual debt limit, we have calculated that the Treasury should have a minimum operating balance in the Federal Reserve banks and the depositories of \$3½ billion. This is only 2 weeks of expenditures. In addition, we have borrowed the assumption that the Treasury should have \$2 billion in unused borrowing authority to deal with unexpected developments and to provide some flexibility in debt management operations. Clearly the cost of debt management is increased if the Treasury must borrow from day to day just what it needs. Efficient debt management requires occasional larger borrowings, particularly as the market is favorable for floating new debt.

Applying these criteria, the debt situation will be unreasonably tight under the present \$298 billion ceiling on March 15 and on June 15. On March 15 the Treasury's best estimate now is that the entire debt ceiling would be exhausted in maintaining its minimum working balance and there would be no allowance for contingencies. The situation is likely to be even tighter on June 15

when the existing public debt limitation would not even permit the Treasury to maintain its normal minimum working balance. To deal with these problems, the Committee on Ways and Means has agreed with the President that this public debt limitation should be raised temporarily to \$300 billion for the balance of the current fiscal year.

When this committee last brought before the Congress its recommendations with respect to the statutory debt limitation for the fiscal year 1962, we applied the same criteria of minimum working balance and allowance for contingencies. The thing that has changed since our recommendation of last June has been principally the Government expenditure picture. Compared to what we expected in June of last year, estimated Federal expenditures have risen by \$4 billion and receipts have risen by \$700 million, making an increase in the deficit to be financed of \$3.3 billion. We are only able to translate this into a somewhat smaller increase in the debt limitation by virtue of the fact that we are closer to the actual time of borrowing and we can get by with a somewhat smaller allowance for contingencies.

If the members of the Committee will look at page 4 of the report of the Committee on Ways and Means they will see the estimates that are made now of what the public debt, subject to this limitation, may be at periodic intervals, the 15th of the month and the last of the month for February, March, April, May, and June.

Members will observe that with respect to June 25, next, it is anticipated, if the Secretary of the Treasury has cash balances on hand on that day of \$3½ billion there will be \$299.2 billion of debt outstanding, leaving only \$800 million of flexibility in the size of the debt on that day, under the ceiling which is contemplated in this legislation.

It would appear, therefore, Mr. Chairman, if the Secretary of the Treasury is to meet the obligations that have been created and are outstanding, this ceiling must be raised for the remainder of this fiscal year or else we place the Secretary of the Treasury in the position of doing one of two things: First, if we do not provide this additional ceiling, the Secretary of the Treasury could direct one of the other Government agencies that has authority to borrow money—the Commodity Credit Corporation for example—to go into the open market and issue its own securities to redeem the securities that the Treasury had purchased from that agency—in the example given, the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that would be a desirable action on the part of the Secretary of the Treasury. Why not? He would be requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to go to the public to borrow money to pay obligations presently due the Secretary of the Treasury.

When this was done under the administration of Secretary of the Treasury, Bob Anderson, our very warm personal friend, at a time when he was cutting himself a little thin in his request for

an increase in the debt ceiling, he had FNMA do that. FNMA went to the public and borrowed almost \$800 million to pay obligations held against FNMA by the Treasury. What was the result? FNMA had to pay out \$18 million more in that process, thereby charging against the public \$18 million more than the Secretary of the Treasury would have been out in borrowing on his authority direct from the public.

Thus you can see that contrary to what some of my friends may think, there is an element of economy with respect to the adjustment of a ceiling on the public debt that may have escaped their attention. It cannot be said, therefore, that as a matter of fact, over and above theory, a vote against a debt ceiling is always a vote representing economy. The General Accounting Office called this matter to the attention of our friend who was then the Secretary of the Treasury. But there was not anything he could say about it, there was not anything he could do about it. He had just misguessed. He and the Congress had missed in their estimate. But as a result the American people were out an additional \$18 million of cost in interest through the use of that device.

I am told by the present Secretary of the Treasury that if he is not given this additional authority, he is forced to do exactly what his predecessor did, except that at this time it would be the Commodity Credit Corporation that would be required to go to the public and float its bonds and pay for existing obligations in the hands of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Now, those bonds will not be bought by the public at as low an interest rate as will regular Government bonds issued under the Second Liberty Loan Act. We would, therefore, of course, have to go out and pay through this device more interest in order to take care of the obligations that are outstanding. That is one alternative. Is that economy? I do not believe it is.

The second alternative is this: If the Secretary does not borrow through that device, we force him to the point, on January 15—if his estimates are right, and the estimates that have been submitted have proven themselves correct—we force him then to confine himself on that day to slightly more money on hand in cash than it costs to finance the Federal Government and its activities for a 5-day period. Now, maybe he could do it; maybe he could not do it within this amount of cash.

If he could not do it, what would be his other alternative? He would have to cut back somewhere in the rate of spending that has been set by act of Congress. Regardless of who caused us to do it, the Congress did set the rate; we cannot escape that; we cannot escape the fact that by majority vote the Congress has fixed the rate of Government spending. We made that commitment by reason of these existing programs. Now, are we going to put the Secretary of the Treasury in the position of exercising that kind of authority? We are going to give him such

authority, and do not think we are not, if it comes to this second alternative, that is, of having to reduce the rate of Government spending. Such a course would give him the authority to make the decision as to where the cuts will be. Where will they be? Does anyone know? Of course not. But, I do not want to give the Secretary of the Treasury the authority to make arbitrary cuts anywhere along the line any more than I want to give him authority to do anything else that I do not want him to do. This is a responsibility of the Congress.

Now, I do not think he would go that route. I think what he would do would be to go through the Commodity Credit Corporation and borrow this more expensive money. I think that is what he would have to do. That is not economical. That is not economy. So, I do not know how we can argue that when we vote against a ceiling increase—not the debt itself but a ceiling increase—how can we say that we are voting for economy? We are not. There is no element of economy in it.

Now, we may be trying to convince somebody that we are against the majority position taken by the Congress on expenditures; in many instances a position that we participated in after we have looked at the total of what we have done and do not like it as we see it. Actually, I have often wondered—as did one of my most revered colleagues on this committee, our late colleague from Pennsylvania, who has departed, and who served as the ranking Republican member of the committee for a time—I have often wondered what is the real purpose of a debt ceiling, anyway. And our very distinguished member of the Committee on Rules from the State of New York [Mrs. St. George] raised the same question when I was before the Committee on Rules.

I remember that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Simpson], earlier raised the same question with respect to the testimony of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Anderson.

Mr. Chairman, on page 15 of the record of the hearings conducted by the Ways and Means Committee on January 17, 1958—and I am quoting from my departed colleague's question—there is the following:

Mr. Secretary, I have never been able to understand why there is such a tremendous concern about the debt limit—

Not the debt but the debt limit—

inasmuch as all you use the money for is to pay bills and the bills are the result of appropriations which are made by the Congress. Why is there a hesitancy in requesting authority to increase?

Secretary ANDERSON, Mr. Simpson, of course what we do in the Treasury is to pay the checks for the bills which are drawn against us for operations of the Government, or for investment, or for purchases by all of the agencies of the Government, as you have indicated. I am sure that the existence of the debt limitation results from the fact that the Constitution gives the Congress the power to borrow money.

I think, undoubtedly, this colloquy between our friend from Pennsylvania and the Secretary of the Treasury has brought to the fore the basic point of

why a ceiling at all? If that is its purpose, do we not want to give this extension of authority to the Secretary of the Treasury, this ceiling within which he must operate in a way that permits him to manage the public debt in the most economical manner possible? Is that not the issue? We talk in terms of the size of the debt; yes. I do not like the fact that we have to come in here because the size of the debt has increased, increased since June 1961, by an additional deficit of almost \$4 billion over what we then predicted. I do not like that any more than you like it. The fact is before us, however, that there is a deficit now contemplated for this fiscal year of \$7 billion instead of \$3.7 billion which was the deficit we had before us as an estimate when we asked you to grant this temporary authority of \$13 billion in June 1961.

Mr. Chairman, now what constitutes that change? Three billion dollars of it occurred as a result of what developed after this debt ceiling was passed last June—arising from the issues involved in the Berlin situation and our speeding up in trying to face that problem. That accounts for \$3 billion of it. In addition to that, it developed that the Department of Agriculture, primarily through the Commodity Credit Corporation, had to have \$737 million more than was estimated it would need in June due to better crops than anticipated. There was an increase of \$300 million in the cost of handling the public debt over what was estimated in June. There was an increase in the spending of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration of \$250 million, and an increase in the Atomic Energy Commission of \$160 million since our estimates of June last year. There were some reductions, but the total adds up to these figures, largely from these operations that I have given you with reference to these particular increases.

Mr. Chairman, did we as a majority voting in the House—yes; upon the request of the administration—provide for a speedup in our military posture of \$3 billion? Of course we did without a dissenting vote. We had no control in this Congress over this additional estimate for the Commodity Credit Corporation of the Department of Agriculture, but by a majority vote we provided for that situation. We had no control over this \$300 million of additional interest required to finance the public debt. It was due in part to an increase in the rate of interest. It was due in part to an increase in the size of the debt.

We provided the additional money for the Space Administration. We provided the additional money for the Atomic Energy Commission. We thought it was the proper thing to do. I ask you now, regardless what the picture looks like, no matter how we may abhor the overall result, if it is not good commonsense to permit the Secretary of the Treasury to finance this in the most economical way possible to him. That is all we are asking, to provide him the tools to do that job.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the Committee, with Secretary Dillon, explored the use of Public Law 86-567 which provides for a \$5 billion cushion?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, we explored the possibility of the use of every law. I wonder if my friend, on the other hand, has explored the possibility of what might happen if that were used?

Mr. GROSS. If what were used?

Mr. MILLS. If that authority to which you refer were used. I would suggest that both sides of these questions have to be considered. I do not want to discuss what might or might not happen, but I think my friend should do as I have done, look into the possibilities that might occur as a result of the use of that authority. I am not saying that it is dark or earthshaking or destructive of our way of life, but there are some facets of it that I think my friend would want to look into.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure of that, but we have this law on the statute books for a \$5 billion cushion.

Mr. MILLS. That is true.

Mr. GROSS. And it will be up for renewal this year. Why renew this law if it is not going to be used? This is a printing-press money bill. I was never for it.

Mr. MILLS. This is not a printing-press money bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am saying to the gentleman that Public Law 86-567 is a printing-press money bill.

Mr. MILLS. That is the very point that I wanted to bring to the gentleman's attention by my question. We certainly do not want to be financing Government obligations through printing press money, do we?

Mr. GROSS. Well, we are doing it.

Mr. MILLS. No, we are not; not through this bill. I am quite willing to stand by the collective judgment of this Congress in its various revenue and expenditure decisions. The existing debt problem is simply the outcome of these decisions—the decision to defend Berlin; to not increase postal rates last year; to provide certain public works; and the rest. Very few of these decisions were unanimous but they were ours. We should provide the Secretary of the Treasury with adequate financing to carry these congressional decisions into effect.

Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting at this point a letter from Secretary Dillon commenting on what would happen if we do not note an increase in the debt ceiling:

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, February 20, 1962.

HON. WILBUR D. MILLS,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In connection with the pending bill to provide a temporary increase of \$2 billion in the public debt limit, you have asked me to explain what would happen if the increase were to be denied. In other words, what is the effect on debt management if the Treasury is forced to conduct its debt management operations under too tight a ceiling?

Since the Treasury must obviously meet the Government's obligations as they become due, and since to do so it must borrow when tax and other revenues fall short of this objective, the answer is plain. If the debt ceiling is too tight to permit finding the necessary funds by public debt borrowing, then the Treasury Department must resort to special operations to find the needed funds. There are, in fact, other ways in which the Treasury may within limits find funds without resort to public debt financing. For example, we can ask the Commodity Credit Corporation to utilize its authority to borrow funds by selling to banks crop loan obligations which CCC had previously purchased. CCC will then use the funds to repay its indebtedness to the Treasury. While this can put the Treasury in funds, it is objectionable because the cost of the borrowing is more expensive than an ordinary Treasury public debt financing.

Indeed, the Report of the Comptroller General of the United States for the fiscal year 1959 sharply criticized the Treasury for persuading FNMA to borrow some \$797 million under its statutory authority at an interest rate that was about seven-eighths of 1 percent more than the Treasury would have had to pay had it issued its own obligations of similar maturities. Secretary Anderson in a reply to this criticism advised the Comptroller General by letter dated March 11, 1960, that the Treasury was forced to resort to this special device since its outstanding public debt was only some \$300 million below the statutory debt limit and its cash balances were inadequate to overcome the difference. Thus both the criticism of the Comptroller General and the reply of Secretary Anderson were justifiable. By being forced to manage the debt at a level too close to the debt ceiling, Secretary Anderson was able to meet the problem but only at an added expense to the United States of some \$18 million over the life of the FNMA issue.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, it is clear that a failure to receive from the Congress the temporary increase in the public debt limit will force the Treasury to obtain the needed funds at substantially greater expense to the public than would otherwise be the case.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS DILLON.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to a very persuasive and quite convincing statement of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means on this problem of increasing, temporarily at least, the debt ceiling by \$2 billion. He has made a very convincing statement of the need for doing that. I want to say this, however, that I have never voted to increase the debt ceiling, only in wartime, when it was absolutely necessary. Then I did. And I am not going to vote to increase the debt ceiling today. I feel that this Congress should do as I have always done personally; I have lived within my income unless faced with an emergency that had to be financed.

Personally, I see no emergency facing this Nation today if—if the Congress will only cut its cloth to suit its pocketbook. But that is something this Congress does not do. The majority of the Members of this Congress, and I am not referring to one side or the other, like to spend more than is coming in. And so they vote to spend it. Therefore, when they vote to spend it, of course, they have to see to it that it is paid some way or another, and if it is to be paid by increasing the debt ceiling, why that is the

only way to do it. But those Members of this Congress who have not been voting for the appropriations, that are more than the receipts of the Government, should not feel under obligation to vote to increase this debt ceiling. I do not feel that way and I shall not vote to increase it.

Mr. Chairman, that in substance is my attitude upon this question before us today. I voted for the rule to bring this before the House so the House could vote its will on the question of increasing this debt ceiling or not to increase it. I voted for the rule. I do not see any reason why anyone should not vote for the rule. That is my attitude on this question that is before the House.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOX] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the legislation before us, H.R. 10050, to increase the public debt limit by \$2 billion, bringing the total debt limit to \$300 billion for the remainder of fiscal year 1962. Thus, the total temporary increase in effect for the balance of this fiscal year is \$15 billion.

Nothing has occurred since January 20, 1961, in Federal fiscal affairs that convinces me the Kennedy administration has a determined desire to live within the limitation of Federal revenues. Since the Kennedy administration took office the projected rate of expenditures of the Federal Government has increased by more than \$1 billion per month and is still increasing. Congress is not obligated to accept blindly the budgetary recommendations of the administration. Indeed, Congress is obligated to exercise its judgment as to priorities of programs so as not to impair our national strength through waste and extravagance.

The debt ceiling has had no restraining effect upon the starting of new domestic programs nor in restricting the expansion of programs already in existence. In short the debt ceiling has not kept us from spending ourselves further into debt.

The mail coming to my office since the first of the year reveals that the overwhelming majority of my constituents do not favor the increasing of so-called Federal Government giveaway programs. My constituents know that we must bring to a halt the wasteful and unnecessary spending in Washington if we are to avoid destruction of the dollar and the imposition of our debts on future generations.

Some Members will excuse an affirmative vote by the rationalization that we must get ourselves out of this mess and the only way we can do it is to increase our debt limitation. I respectfully submit to the House membership that another course is open and that is to live within our means. Let the spenders come forward with the way to pay. Congress should follow the straightforward

course of living within the limits of our willingness to pay our way.

I am opposed to the spending and borrowing fiscal folly of this administration. Increasing the public debt limitation must cease to be the expedient way and become an unheard method of conducting the fiscal affairs of the Federal Government. Our national security is at stake.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I voted against the rule because I felt it should be open, but I explained the reason behind that. I am in favor of the bill and I think the chairman of our committee has expressed my reasons. I might say those are the reasons of the majority on my side of the committee for supporting this measure, and supporting it with great reluctance. I do call the attention of the House to the separate views of the Republicans on this bill which appear on page 7 and run through page 11 of the committee report. The chairman is eminently correct when he says this is not a debt limitation bill. This is a debt management bill. The debt has already been created and the issues involved are how we are going to finance the authority to spend, and the appropriations that we have given to the executive department. Now I notice, and I would sure like to pin this on the record, that each year there are some of what I call spenders who vote for every appropriation and who try to up all the amendments on appropriations who use a negative vote on this bill as their device to try to tell their constituents that they really are against the big Federal debt. That, to me, is most regrettable. However, I can sympathize and I do sympathize with those who vote against most of the spending programs or at least the programs to increase the budget and who vote to try to bring the expenditures down within a more reasonable figure in relation to our revenues. I think my record on expenditures is probably as tight as anyone's. I want to spend money for people and things, if we have it, but I recognize that if you do not have it, you are doing a disservice to them and you are doing a disservice to your country, and I think we have got to get discipline into this matter.

The question is raised each time: "What is the purpose of this so-called debt limit bill?" Or as it should be termed, debt-management bill. Really, from an economic standpoint it does not serve a purpose; in fact, it is a dangerous thing and probably should be eliminated. In these days, though, where the Congress still has failed to establish the necessary machinery to go into the overall expenditures in the budget, perhaps it does serve the purpose of providing some discipline. At least, on this day our eyes are focused on the question of our fiscal policy. Possibly it does serve that purpose of going over and discussing what has transpired.

I have about five points I think need to be made, and this bill before us does provide the appropriate time to do so.

First, I would observe that inasmuch as the President originally proposed, a \$10 billion debt increase now dropped down to \$2 billion for this bite and \$8 billion later, he did not present to us a real balanced budget for the coming fiscal year. I think anyone who goes into the details of this so-called balanced budget for fiscal year 1963 realizes that it is only a balance in name; in actuality it is very definitely imbalanced because of unrealistic estimates on both the expenditure side and the revenue side. Certainly, that is something we all want to direct our attention to, because it is a serious matter. This request for increased debt ceiling certainly does prove so, because if the 1963 budget were a balanced budget we would not need this additional \$8 billion. I think we would need this additional \$2 billion.

Second, I think we should point out and go into detail whether or not this really was—that is, the \$2 billion I am talking about now—a result of the Berlin crisis. I respect my chairman's position in stating that it was—and indeed the Treasury Department testified that it was, but I think there is considerable evidence to demonstrate that it is not. A case has not been established. In executive session I interrogated the Bureau of the Budget people and the Treasury people to find out, and they finally said: "Well, we actually cannot prove it. You would have to go into too many details."

I am very anxious that we do go into detail. I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORB] is going to devote some time to this today and he, being on the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, is eminently qualified to speak to it. This does not seem to be the case. Possibly as much as \$2 billion might be related to the Berlin crisis, but not \$3 billion.

Thirdly, I want to call attention at this time to a letter that some other Members of the House on my side and myself directed to the President right after he delivered his message in regard to the Berlin situation, asking him where we should cut back in nondefense expenditures so that we could absorb whatever was necessary to meet the Berlin crisis. Not a single word has come from the President to the Congress or to this group who wrote to him about where we might cut back on nondefense expenditures. There was no attempt by the President to pay attention to the importance of a balanced budget as it relates to fiscal responsibility. Nor is this increased budget primarily for defense items. The increases in nondefense expenditures and new obligatory authorities requests exceed the defense items.

I well recall the President's inaugural address to the people of this country, saying to them: "Do not ask what the Nation can do for you, but rather what you can do for the Nation." If those bold words, those brave words, words that I think sunk deeply into the hearts of all the American people, were to be meaningful, here was the time to have given to the Congress, to the people's representatives, reasons why because of the Berlin crisis and international problems, we needed to cut back in some of these

nondefense areas. Instead the President requested the Congress to vote more great nondefense expenditure programs.

I think we can examine that at this time of considering raising the debt ceiling. We would not be in this crisis asking for a \$2 billion debt increase had the President of the United States exercised some discipline on himself and on the executive branch of the Government in the nondefense area. Certainly there is no need for an \$8 billion additional increase if the proper discipline and regard for a balanced budget is shown by the President.

Another point, a fourth point, can be made at this time and should always be made, a point really that has not been dwelled upon sufficiently in the past. I refer to the flexibility that the executive department has to translate obligational authority into expenditures. I came very close on this occasion to opposing this \$2 billion increase because of the fact that the President does have great flexibility. My chairman pointed out that we do not want to give authority to the Executive to cut where he wants to, which we would force upon him if we do not grant this request. I would point out, however, that already the Executive has considerable flexibility to do just that if he chooses to do so.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. I was not talking about what the President or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget or other departments could do. I was talking about the Secretary of the Treasury being put in that position.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I misunderstood. I could not agree more with the gentleman. If the chairman had been making this point it would have had some possible merit, because, sure, we leave the President with this flexibility and he has the authority, but the Congress can move into this area and do something itself if it would. Congress is not on too firm ground in simply saying that the President has that flexibility even though he has. I think it is worth pointing out, however, because the people can rightfully criticize both the President and the Congress. Both are derelict. However, the President truthfully can do a great deal more about it than the Congress.

I want to illustrate this further by quoting a table directly from the President's budget message this year. I refer to page 10 of the report where the table appears. Here is the point I want to make. The President says this is a balanced budget because the budget expenditure for 1963 is \$92.5 billion. Note the word "expenditure." Look at the bottom, however, for new obligational authority—the President asks authority to spend \$99.3 billion not \$92.5 billion. There is the flexibility. He requests \$6.8 billion. Then, consider the unused obligational authority he has carried over from previous budgets. I have figured this up, and it is over \$80 billion. There is considerable flexibility. He can program. He does not have to convert obligational authority into expendi-

tures. He can accelerate or decelerate. As a matter of fact, normal routine. The Executive is constantly doing just that; and \$2 billion is just about 2 percent of his budget—well within the area of reasonable discretion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we break down the items in the budget to see where this differential between expenditure estimates and new obligational authority requests come. This is something that people of the country are interested in and should know. The President has been talking about his education bills. If he really is sincere about that, they should be budgeted. They are budgeted in, one, an item of \$600 million for new obligational authority, for school construction and teachers' salaries, and so forth, but the estimate of expenditures for fiscal year 1963 is around \$90 million. In reference to a bill we have already passed in regard to higher education, the budget request was for \$332 million of new obligational authority and the expenditure \$20.8 million. Who are we kidding—the people who think the Federal Government is going to give money for education or the people who think we have a balanced budget? If the people are going to get this money in education, the budget is unbalanced. Those who think the budget is balanced do so on the assumption that the money will not be spent, according to the President's own figures.

There is one other point I should like to make.

A lot of people are taking consolation in the fact that the debt is a less percentage of the gross national product than it was during World War II. We know we must have resiliency to be able to move in a crisis, or in the event we should have war. What resiliency do we have if in peacetime we have a debt of the same percentage of GNP we had during the war? Furthermore, let us look at what happened as the result of a debt that was of such high percentage of the gross national product as that of World War II, it resulted in serious inflation.

That is what cut the purchasing power of the dollar to 50 cents after World War II. We had to monetize the debt in order to manage it, or at least that is what President Truman's fiscal advisers recommended be done and it was done. I thought one of the great achievements of the Eisenhower administration was cutting the percentage of the debt in respect to gross national product. Now this administration comes forward and wants to use that leeway—it is not leeway, really—but wants to use that differential and go backward in peacetime saying, "Well, we don't have to worry because we are still not getting beyond the ratio to the gross national product we had during wartime." This, in my judgment, is dangerous, dangerous economics.

So, my concluding observations are, we have to increase the amount of bonds the Treasury can sell because we have a

March 15 deadline where we have to have the cash to pay for these obligations to incur expenditures that this Congress has told the President he may make. Otherwise, it is going to cost us more money in handling the payment of our obligations. Good economics requires us to vote for this bill. But, we should use this occasion to point out some of the weaknesses of our present fiscal policy and to call the attention of the people of this country to this, and I hope of the Executive, if he reads congressional speeches.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN].

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Chairman, just in case some members of the Committee are not aware of the latest developments of the historic flight taking place today, Lt. Col. John Glenn has landed 6 miles from the nearest destroyer, and helicopters from that destroyer are now at the scene, and he is in good shape.

Mr. Chairman, I have a rather unusual contribution to the debate today that might be titled "A Twice-Used Speech." As a prelude I would like to point out—and I think all members of the committee will agree with me—that no Member of the House ever forgets his first trip to the well of the House for the delivery of his maiden speech. It is a memory usually wrapped around shaking knees and a somewhat dry throat, and I think all Members hesitate long before they make that icy plunge and wait until they feel rather strongly about some bill or resolution.

Nine years ago, Mr. Chairman, I had this strong feeling. The then President of the United States, Dwight D. Eisenhower, had a request for an increase of \$15 billion in the national debt limit. I felt—in fact, I knew—that there was some partisanship at that time.

If you will bear with me, Mr. Chairman, I would like to repeat word for word what I said on that occasion. My remarks then, quite frankly, were aimed mainly at some of my colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. They are addressed today mainly to some of my friends on the Republican side. On that day, July 31, 1953, I said:

There has been some discussion as to the responsibility for the need to increase the national debt limit. It has been said that it is the impact of past appropriations and spendings. Some have said that it could have been avoided by lower appropriations this year.

I am not interested in the political implications because I believe the integrity of the United States is far too important for politics or political advantage.

In this savage world in which we live, the nations are choosing up sides. Many will go to the stronger side. Will those nations not regard as weak a country which might have to default on its obligations because we refused here today to lift the debt limit? Will they not be told by our enemies that the great United States is broke and bankrupt? We dare not risk the chance of blunting the weapons we already have forged in the cold war.

Mr. Chairman, if the occupant of the White House was a Democrat and he sent to us this bill, backed by the facts we have before us, I would vote for the measure. I

would not be true to myself if I voted differently because the President today is a Republican. I shall support the bill.

I meant that 9 years ago, Mr. Chairman, and I believe by changing two words in that entire speech it is applicable today.

I was very happy on that occasion 9 years ago when the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] said something rather nice about my remarks, and he added:

His conclusion nobody can contest or argue with. Because this request comes from a Republican administration is no justification for not standing up to it and voting for it.

Mr. Chairman, I say today that because this request comes from a Democratic administration is no justification for not standing up to it and voting for it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Since the gentleman from New York mentioned my name and repeated what I said at that time, may I assure the gentleman that I today am going to vote for this \$2 billion increase.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. I would not have mentioned the gentleman's name if I had not really believed that from the beginning. I am sure that the gentleman believes that in matters such as this we must rise above partisanship. It is not a question of wanting to do it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROUSSELOT].

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 10050, which would provide for further so-called temporary increases in the public debt limit by \$2 billion.

The people of my district, and I believe the overwhelming majority of the American people, have been pushed to their limit in being asked time and time again to allow our Federal Government to live differently than they as individual citizens are required to live. There is a point beyond which the Federal Government, like local governments, big corporations, small businesses, voluntary organizations, and individuals, cannot go in building up its indebtedness. Every time we increase the Federal debt, we also increase the cost of keeping that debt afloat. I believe, therefore, that the time has come to stand firm against the policy of allowing the Federal Government to be any different than individual citizens in managing its debts.

My reasons for opposing this bill are very positive. They relate to the very survival of the integrity of our financial position in the world. My reasons can be summarized as follows:

First. Past experience in both this House and the other distinguished body, the Senate of the United States, has shown that opposition to increasing the debt ceiling has not resulted in chaos, panic, or irresponsibility. As my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER], has pointed out, opposition to increases has actually had a healthy effect on our economy. In 1954 a Member of the other body, Senator HARRY BYRD, vigorously opposed legislation to raise the national debt ceiling by \$15 billion. His efforts helped defeat the legislation. The defeat of this legislation did not destroy the ability of the Federal Government to maintain proper defenses and to cover its major domestic responsibilities. In fact, it encouraged a more responsible approach to spending because the executive branch, which was then under the management of my party, the Republican Party, was forced to pare down expenditures.

Second. By refusing to increase the debt ceiling, we would be taking a positive step to force economy within the executive branch. I am sure that President Kennedy wants to be an advocate of economy within the executive branch. How can he show this? By using the much-abused Executive order privilege to effect an across-the-board reduction in all domestic programs. This need not hurt our defense posture one iota.

Third. Former Budget Bureau Director Maurice Stans recently said that our true deficit comes close to \$800 billion, not \$300 billion. Statisticians fail to include the back-door expenditures that occur each year in the oft-quoted \$300 billion figure. I believe the national debt has gone beyond all reason. We must begin to take positive steps to reduce it.

Fourth. The interest charge included in our annual Federal budget just to maintain the present debt is the second largest expenditure item in the budget. This charge costs the American taxpayers \$9 billion each year. I do not intend to be a part of adding to this charge by supporting a \$2 billion debt ceiling increase.

Fifth. According to Maurice Stans, each American family of four is presently carrying \$22,000 on his back as his share of the national debt. I know that the overwhelming number of families in my district does not want to have this burden increased. The statement is sometimes made that somehow we will be able to have better debt management by adding to it. This just does not make sense to me, and I am sure the average American family does not improve its individual debt management by continually adding to it.

Sixth. It has been said that we should support the bill now before us because under the Eisenhower administration some \$25 billion was added to our debt. I am a Republican and plan to remain one, but this is no excuse. Two wrongs do not make a right. We are not going to rectify a mistake of the Eisenhower administration by increasing our Federal debt. I understand the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE] plans to point this out more clearly later today. He will make the point that mistakes of

previous administrations should not be carried on by the present administration.

I am asked many times, "What is your alternative?" As a conservative you cannot just be against everything, and I am not. I have, therefore, today introduced a bill calling for the reduction of our debt on a systematic basis each year. I will have more to say about this bill in future days, but I have put in the hopper a piece of legislation which will accomplish the following: First, place a moral obligation on the executive branch to send a balanced budget each year; second, limit congressional appropriations each year to anticipated revenue, except in times of war, national disaster, or emergency; and third, 1 percent annual reduction of debt on Second Liberty Bond Act.

The text of the bill and other articles relating to this subject follow:

A BILL BY THE HONORABLE JOHN H. ROUSSELOT TO PROVIDE THAT FEDERAL EXPENDITURES SHALL NOT EXCEED FEDERAL REVENUES, EXCEPT IN TIME OF WAR, NATIONAL DISASTER, OR EMERGENCY, AND TO PROVIDE FOR THE RETIREMENT OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the expenditures of the Government during each fiscal year, including reduction of the public debt in accordance with the limitations thereon imposed by the amendment made by section 2, may not exceed its revenues for such year except—

(1) in time of war declared by Congress; or
(2) upon determination and certification to Congress by the President that a national disaster, or emergency has occurred, or is occurring if such certification is approved by each House by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the authorized membership of that House. No such certification shall be effective except for the duration of the fiscal year with respect to which approval by each House is given.

SEC. 2. Section 21 of the Second Liberty Bond Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 757b), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 21." and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(b) The aggregate face amount of obligations referred to in subsection (a) (other than obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) is hereby reduced, as of July 1 of the fiscal year which begins after the date of enactment of this sentence, and on July 1 of each fiscal year beginning thereafter, by an amount equal to not less than 1 per centum of the aggregate face amount of such obligations (other than obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on July 1 of the year in which this sentence is enacted."

SEC. 3. (a) The budget submitted annually by the President pursuant to section 201 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, shall be prepared to insure compliance with the first section of this Act.

(b) Notwithstanding any obligatory authority granted or appropriations made (except with respect to the legislative and judicial branches of the Government), the President shall from time to time during each fiscal year take such action as may be necessary (by placing funds in reserve, by apportionment of funds, or otherwise) to insure compliance with the first section of this Act.

SEC. 4. The Congress shall not enact appropriations measures which will result in expenditures by the Government during any fiscal year in excess of its estimated revenues for such year (as such revenues have

been estimated in the budget submitted by the President), except—

(1) to the extent of any additional revenues of the Government for such fiscal year resulting from tax legislation enacted after submission of the budget for such fiscal year;

(2) in time of war declared by the Congress; or

(3) upon determination and certification to Congress by the President that a national disaster or emergency has occurred, or is occurring, if such certification is approved by each House by the affirmative vote of at least two-thirds of the authorized membership of that House. No such certification shall be effective except for the duration of the fiscal year with respect to which approval by each House is given.

[From the Chicago Daily Tribune, Nov. 27, 1961]

DR. PALYI COMMENTS: THREAT OF NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY OR U.S. ABILITY "TO PAY ON DOT"

(By Melchior Palyi)

COLOGNE, GERMANY, November 28.—If you cannot pay your bills—you are "illiquid." You may talk the creditors into some arrangement. You may sell some assets, or borrow fresh somewhere else. But if you go on spending more than you earn, bankruptcy is the end of the road, unless a rich uncle comes to your rescue.

Exactly the same problem and the identical choice of remedies face nations that live too high on the hog—spend abroad far beyond what they earn abroad. They run up deficits year after year in their international payments. At the day of reckoning, literally, they get stuck in "international illiquidity," a fancy name for a very prosaic situation. That is where we are. And we have ample company.

HEADING FOR BANKRUPTCY?

The threat of imminent national bankruptcy, by whatever name it goes, is staring in our collective faces. It consists in the inability of the Government to pay out in gold short maturity claims of foreigners at the fixed rate of one ounce of fine gold for each \$35.0875 claimed. Thus far, the U.S. Treasury does hand out the gold at that rate to the foreigners who offer dollars. If they sell the dollars on a gold market abroad, the Treasury steps in by selling gold. So, the gold value of the dollar is being maintained approximately at par.

WHY IS THERE DOUBT?

Why should the foreigners ask for gold in lieu of dollars? They would much rather have the dollars (and short-term dollar securities which yield a return) as long as the dollars are "as good as gold." But the world has begun to doubt our Government's ability, or will, to fulfill its implicit contractual obligation—to pay in gold at the par value of the dollar.

Why should there be any doubt about our national solvency? National honesty is at stake. As to our ability to pay on the dot: Are we not the richest nation on earth? Actually, our balance of "current" trade produces every year a handsome surplus. This current balance includes all commodity and service transactions, even the transfer of capital for long-term investment, and the return on foreign investments. But the Government keeps overspending the surplus, turning it into deficits.

At the root of the trouble is the inflation. Inflated labor costs undermine the ability of our exporters to compete abroad. The volume of imports is boosted, ever more private and public spending abroad is induced, and our manufacturers are driven out of the country in search of greener pastures.

What does the Government do to restore confidence in the dollar? Rose colored

speeches aside, all it does is—to look for a rich uncle to bail out the nephew who used to be the uncle not so long ago.

QUESTION OF CONFIDENCE

We still have a gold reserve of \$17 billion, having lost more than \$7 billion in gold since the last war, more than \$5 billion since early 1958. This year, the deficit in foreign payments will be only \$2 billion, provided that the run on the dollar does not restart. It might do so on no notice at all, in view of the fact that our short-term debt to foreigners—some \$27 billion—keeps growing while the gold reserve is being whittled down.

We also have some \$6 billion in "liquid" claims against foreign countries. Try to collect and pronto, they may "freeze" the flow of their currencies.

The dollar still enjoys worldwide repute, if a somewhat shaky one. It is not too late to take remedial steps in order to restore our balance of payments, the prime condition for a balanced economic growth.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 5, 1962]

PERSPECTIVE: BIG, BUT WHAT IS IT?

(By Raymond Moley)

As the new Kennedy budget reveals itself in the press, we pause for identification. For now, in the estimates for fiscal 1963, we see the first genuine pattern of New Frontier ideas and purposes. The President's budget for 1962 presented a year ago was a hasty revision of the budget prepared under the Eisenhower regime. Now there can be no suggestion of haste or improvisation. For the President, his Budget Bureau, and the various Departments and Agencies have had a year to put together their plans for the sort of nation they want to establish. In short, to implement their philosophy—if they have one. What emerges?

It is certainly big. The spending the President asked for is \$11 billion more than the year ending last June and \$16 billion more than the last full Eisenhower year.

Is this socialism? No, although there is some socialism in it. Generally, the pattern is not to take over means of production except in such areas as the production and transmission of electric power. The philosophy which has replaced socialism is not to undertake the immense responsibility of running the means of production. Instead, it is the easier process of taking the product of private production in money, through taxation.

Is it the welfare state? No, although there is a lot of welfare in it.

NO CONSISTENCY

Is it a return to the planned economy which so many were hopeful of establishing in the 1930's? No. To call this great indiscriminate mass of benefits and projects a plan is to desecrate a good old word. Nobody planned all this. It was not created; it simply accumulated.

That becomes clear when we examine the list of innumerable odds and ends for which money is to be spent. There is nothing homogeneous about such a collection. There is no likeness or interrelationship among such items as subsidized transportation for city and suburban dwellers, rural telephones, school lunches, a National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice, the preservation of life among ducks and bears, retraining workers displaced by automation, and aid to speculators in land through urban renewal. There is provided not only money for stopping juvenile delinquency but for the enlargement of prisons. For buying tombstones and for studying the Greek Orthodox Church in Alaska.

I prefer to call the new Federal establishment, which is casting its shadow over the Doric simplicity of our original constitutional system, by another name. This was suggested more than 40 years ago by Dean

Pound of the Harvard Law School: The superservice state. Abundance there is, but consistency there is not.

Its limit is described by Parkinson's "second law," which holds that in modern governments expenditures rise to the limits of income. In the case at hand, if revenues from taxes fail to meet expenditures, a capital levy on savings is enacted through inflation.

SEMANTICS

There is also in the new dispensation a depreciation in the meaning of old words by a simple revision. A very large proportion of the increase in this budget comes because of back-door spending. These expenditures really take money from the Treasury, and the schoolboys of the Nation will read in their Constitution that no money is to be taken from the Treasury "but in consequence of appropriations made by law." Back-door spending since 1932 has been accomplished to the extent of more than \$100 billion by the simple device of not calling these expenditures "appropriations."

In the President's state of the Union message he referred to the prospective purchase by the United States of \$100 million of United Nations bonds. He admitted that many members of that organization do little to support it but that in order to have the right to sound off and vote they pay their dues. Those dues would, he said, pay the interest on the bonds. And then the President said that such borrowing with the payment of interest would keep the U.N. solvent. Since I never heard of anyone becoming more solvent by borrowing money, I sought Webster. It says that to be solvent is "to be able or sufficient to pay all debts." Thus we move into the frontier of semantics.

[From Newsweek, Feb. 5, 1962]

BUSINESS TIDES: NOTES ON THE BUDGET

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Is it balanced? The President estimates that the Federal Government will spend \$92.5 billion in the fiscal year 1963, and will take in revenues of \$93 billion, leaving a surplus of \$463 million. This would be the first surplus in 3 years and the second in six. But the forecast is based on a series of the most optimistic assumptions. Revenue forecasts, for example, are based on the expectation of unparalleled prosperity. With no important net change in tax rates, revenues are counted upon to jump from \$82.1 billion in fiscal 1962 to \$93 billion in fiscal 1963. If revenues did not increase, the predicted surplus of half a billion would become a deficit of \$10.4 billion.

How reliable? In the light of the past record, how much confidence can we place in the new estimates? It is ironic to recall that for the fiscal year 1959, which ended with a deficit of \$12.4 billion, Eisenhower originally estimated a surplus of nearly half a billion, almost exactly what Mr. Kennedy now estimates for 1963. But in 1959 expenditures turned out to be \$6.8 billion more than the estimate, and receipts \$6.1 billion less. Eisenhower originally estimated a surplus for the current fiscal year of \$1.5 billion. Last March Mr. Kennedy estimated instead a deficit of \$2.8 billion. In July this was raised to \$5.3 billion. It is now estimated at \$7 billion—with the year only a little more than half over. If an estimated deficit is raised a billion dollars or so every 2 or 3 months, what confidence can we have in a paper-thin surplus forecast 17 months ahead?

Why so big? The spending estimates for fiscal 1963 are the highest on record in peacetime—\$11 billion higher than in 1961 and \$28 billion higher than in 1955. The taxes to support such spending must undermine productive incentives and siphon off the funds for investment. Sentences in the President's message give the impression that the rise in Federal spending is almost en-

tirely caused by increased costs of defense. But even with the heavy increase in proposed defense spending to \$52.7 billion, more than half of our total spending of \$114.8 billion (when we count social security and similar payments) is still on nondefense and welfare items. Even when we confine ourselves to the regular budget, we find that compared with the last completed year, 1961, though projected national defense expenditures have increased \$5.2 billion, nondefense and other expenditures have increased \$5.8 billion. Nondefense expenditures of \$39.3 billion projected for fiscal 1963 are almost double the \$20.9 billion nondefense expenditures in 1954.

More needs met? It is a fallacy to suppose that the enormous new budget enables the American people to meet more needs on net balance than before. All it does is to transfer expenditures from the free enterprise sector of the economy to the socialized sector, from the voluntary sector to the compulsory sector. The Government can give nothing to Paul that it does not take from Peter. Everybody is forced to pay for somebody else's education or illness. As Bastiat put it more than a century ago: "Government is the great fiction through which everybody tries to live at the expense of everybody else."

Inflation threat: A few months ago Mr. Kennedy gave his support to the theory that an annually balanced budget was unnecessary; all that was needed was a balance over the years of the business cycle. But even this theory involved the implicit assumption that if, say, we ran deficits of \$7 billion to \$12 billion in our bad years, we would have to run equally huge surpluses in our good years. Now Mr. Kennedy's budget message rests explicitly on the theory that though we need heavy deficits to turn the business cycle from recession to recovery, even a budget balance at any time, let alone an actual surplus, may endanger prosperity, and that the President needs discretionary standby powers to cut taxes or increase spending to cure unemployment.

This theory is very fashionable but quite fallacious. Not merely the new budget itself, but even more the new explicit budget philosophy behind it, must increase the threat and fear of inflation and undermine confidence in the American dollar.

EXCERPTS FROM "A REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN, JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, 25TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA."

The President claims in his state of the Union message that his budget for fiscal 1963 (July 1, 1962, to July 1, 1963) will be in balance. But I have my doubts in light of the President's request for a hike of \$10 billion in the national debt limit and for standby authority to spend \$99.303 billion in case of an emergency.

Commenting on the President's message, Representative HOWARD SMITH, a Democrat, and chairman of the House Rules Committee, has said:

"In the past, increased spending made necessary by defense programs has been offset in part by curtailment of domestic spending. I regret that there is no such indication in this message. On the contrary, Congress is being asked for an increase in the debt limit to meet the proposed additional expenditures in the domestic and welfare field."

In my opinion, the 1963 Federal budget, which is the first all-Kennedy budget, will fall short of expenditures by at least \$1 billion. I hope the President realizes that unless we abandon the big-spending approach to government and start living within our means our free enterprise economy cannot survive. Continual deficit financing leads to higher taxes and higher taxes bleed the private sector of the economy of necessary capital.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. My delay, Mr. Chairman, in walking onto the floor at this moment was in my hope that I among many others would hear the word from John Glenn personally that he was all right. Everything up to that point has been successful. Apparently the capsule is safe and we hope he is, too.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to add a few thoughts possibly beyond what has been said in this debate today, simply because I believe on the record these views need to be expressed. I shall be very brief, as is the minority statement signed by the gentleman from California [Mr. URR] and myself, found on the last page of the report. My position is the same as that of last year when for the first time in my four terms I decided I would no longer support a continued increase of the debt ceiling, my feeling being that there might be a possibility of controlling spending by refusing to agree to these continual increases of the debt ceiling. As a matter of fact, I am one of those who, as in the minority views, as expressed, feels it is ridiculous to go along with this gimmick any further—the gimmick of a temporary increase. There is nothing temporary about a Government increase of taxes or of the debt ceiling. It is not temporary. It will be permanent. I decry the use of the word "temporary."

Second, I believe that the debt limit ceiling is not responsible at all for any restraint on spending, nor does it limit the Government's power to tax, spend, or borrow. Indeed, on the contrary. The Government has no such limitation and I am among those who believe that there should be a constitutional amendment to force the Government to live within a balanced budget so that the Members of Congress should not adjourn to go back to their districts until they have a balanced budget for the year.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for the purpose of making a very important announcement?

Mr. ALGER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I have just had a telephone call from NASA headquarters to the effect that Colonel Glenn has been landed aboard the carrier and has left the capsule. This is the culmination of a great scientific experiment that again reestablishes us in the forefront in the space effort. I am certain that Vice President JOHNSON, who has been active in this, and Speaker MCCORMACK, who pioneered the first Science and Astronautics Committee in the House, are very happy to get this information, as are the American people.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, what a pleasure it is for me to have yielded to the gentleman for that announcement and to assure him, of course, that all of us, regardless of party, join in the praise for the many who have been responsible for the program. And certainly, and most importantly, to this brave astro-

naut himself who went through so much for us all.

Mr. Chairman, now back to the matter of the debt limit; and I must say this is almost from the sublime to the ridiculous in view of my opinion on the debt limit itself. I want to remind my colleagues of something that a gentleman from the other body, one of the great chairmen of that august body said when confronted with an increase in the debt ceiling in 1954. These remarks I think have a bearing on our deliberations today.

It was a year ago that the President requested Congress to increase the debt limit from \$275 billion to \$290 billion. A bill making this increase was passed by the House of Representatives and sent to the Senate. The Senate Finance Committee heard the testimony of administration spokesmen who said unless the debt limit were raised by \$15 billion at that time the Government would be unable to pay its bills and a panic would result.

After full deliberation, the Finance Committee, 11 to 4, refused to report the \$290 billion debt limit bill. What happened? The heavens did not fall; panic did not occur. The administration reduced its spending and stayed within the statutory debt limit.

Mr. Chairman, that as I see it is the matter in a nutshell. Yes, the administration might have to tailor their program to the amount of money available. Yes, the President and Congress might indeed be forced to limit spending by holding down the debt ceiling.

One of my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], used to say that holding down Government spending by holding down the debt ceiling was like trying to hold the elevator by hanging onto the pointer. It might just be, in view of what Senator BYRD has said, that if we refuse to increase the debt ceiling the Government might be more responsible in its spending. At least that is my view. I, as one who has opposed increase in spending programs when I thought they were irresponsible fiscally, have opposed the spending that makes this increase of the debt ceiling necessary, so I, of course, consistently may refuse to go along with the increase in the debt ceiling.

It is my feeling that if a sufficient number of my colleagues did the same we could get our Government back on a fiscally sound basis, we could balance the budget, we could reduce taxes, and, most importantly, we could reduce the debt, not increase it.

It may well be that our deficit balance of payments could force the administration and the Democratic leaders to become fiscally more responsible. Our deficit in the last quarter of \$1.4 billion is at an annual rate of \$6 billion. We may be forced to cut back the tremendous increases in social and welfare fields, that is, nondefense, in order to preserve the value of our currency against the gold outflow.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT].

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I recognize the present necessity, a necessity which confronts us in almost this

identical way each time it becomes expedient for us to increase the debt ceiling. Recognizing that, I acknowledge that those who speak against increasing the debt ceiling as a matter of principle may be voices crying in the wilderness. And yet it seems to me that whether you regard yourself as a Democrat or a Republican, a liberal or a conservative or a moderate, whether you might be called a spender or a tightwad, one fundamental principle might be agreed upon by all; and that is that this country is rich enough, it is able enough, it is prosperous enough to pay as we go.

If we desire additional services by the Government then we should be willing to vote the necessary revenues to pay for those services in the years they are required. If we are not willing to pay for them by additional current revenues then we ought to be willing to do without them.

It seems to me that there can be neither reason nor excuse for continuing year after year to increase the national debt.

The fundamental evil in so doing is that we are passing on to another generation the responsibility of paying for things which we will have used up and worn out before their time. This practice, by any standard of justice, is basically unsound and cruelly unfair.

Where in 25 years will be the things which our current borrowings will buy? Where will be the shiny missiles of today, or today's aircraft, or the unemployment compensation checks mailed out this month, or the services which bolster our present economy? Of what benefit will they be to those whose charge it will be to pay in another generation?

No more, I think, than the service we now enjoy from the B-24's and the B-17's which today lie in archaic abandon along deserted landing strips. At least they saved our freedom and preserved our Nation intact. There was an excuse for increasing the national debt during World War II. We were in a death struggle, a crash effort for our national survival. We had to borrow against the future.

But there can be no such justification today. Though we are indeed engaged in a conflict of wills and weapons to preserve both freedom and peace, we can pay for it on an annual basis. No nation of men has ever been so well able to pay for it as we are today. Shall we forever pass on to the future the unpleasant task of paying, when reason tells us that our progeny will have crises of their own?

In the past 7 years, we have five times increased the debt ceiling. Yet these have been years of truly unprecedented national prosperity. There is no plausible reason why prudent men acting upon the courage of their convictions could not have balanced the Federal budget during these years and begun some systematic plan of debt retirement.

To be sure, there have been emergencies during this period. But there will always be emergencies. Individual families and businesses have emergencies and still manage to pay their debts. They do so because they have to

do so. By what logic should the Government operate on a different principle?

For 13 years, we have made no reduction in the national debt. We have merely paid interest and continue to increase the total indebtedness. The last time any payment was made on the principal itself, Harry Truman was in the White House.

What family would expect to occupy a house for 13 years and pay to the mortgageholder only the interest on the debt? What intelligent family would want to do so, earning no equity whatever in the property and still owing the total amount after making regular payment for 13 years?

As every family knows, the time to pay debts is when you have money. This Nation has been more prosperous and more able to retire its honest debts during these past 13 years than any nation or civilization in the entire history of the world. Yet we have not done so. One cannot help but wonder if we ever intend to do so.

During the last Congress, 31 of my colleagues and I introduced identical bills to commit the Congress to a program of systematic annual debt retirement. In 1959, some of us appeared before the Rules Committee and asked for the kind of a rule which would have permitted us to offer our proposal as an amendment to the bill then being considered to extend the national debt ceiling. We were denied, and that bill was brought out under a closed rule which as all of the Members understand prohibits amendments of any type.

Today's bill comes before us under a similar closed rule.

We asked for permission to have our bills considered in the Ways and Means Committee to which they had been referred. To date, no hearing has been set.

Yet in the months which have intervened, the debt has risen from \$283 billion to an estimated \$295 billion, and authorization is being sought in the present bill to raise the ceiling to \$300 billion. Is there to be no end to this?

At that time, we were being asked to pay \$8.1 billion in annual interest charges. The budget for the new fiscal year anticipates that we shall be required to pay \$9.4 billion in the year which begins next July 1.

Interest charges, as most of us know, today constitute the second largest item in the operation of our Government. They soak up approximately 11 percent of our total national budget. We pay 11 cents out of every tax dollar simply for the privilege of owing this huge debt. For every \$100 paid in taxes, \$11 are thus consumed.

Those \$11 buy nothing of use to the American taxpayers. They do not help to buy a single weapon, launch a single missile, pave a single mile of road, mail a single letter, or perform a single service of the Government.

The taxpayer can never receive any relief from this ever-increasing annual burden of interest until first we begin to live within our Federal income annually and make a regular plan of debt reduction.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I think the gentleman has made a fine statement. Then to make his own position consistent, what additional taxes have you recommended or would you recommend that the Committee on Ways and Means recommend to the House to impose? We have a bill right now which has a deficit in it. Is that not a fair question?

Mr. WRIGHT. I am conscious of that and I do think it is a fair question. From time to time I have supported certain taxes necessary to maintain the pay-as-we-go principle. To name a few, I supported the highway user taxes to build the interstate program out of current revenues and opposed the long-term bonding proposal which would have created further debt. I have supported necessary increases in the social security tax to make that structure actuarially sound. I have on occasion supported increases in certain classes of postage where the rate structure was responsible for deficits. I opposed the lease-purchase plan for public buildings, as that was contributing to our debt, and insisted instead that necessary buildings be constructed out of current revenues.

I do not think it is my personal prerogative nor is it my desire to recommend additional taxes at this particular time. Rather I think we might wait and see if the President's budget is truly balanced and if there may be reductions and deletions which the Congress may see fit to vote, or proposals which the Ways and Means Committee may recommend. However, I would say that each Member ought to have a criterion of this type, and I have tried to devise one which is satisfactory to me personally and may be to other Members as well.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WRIGHT. If the gentleman would not mind withholding, there are a few things which I should like to say before my time expires. If time remains, I shall be glad to yield further.

Since coming to Congress I have rather carefully tried to keep a record of the expenditures for which I have voted and the proposed reductions in those expenditures which I have supported, and have balanced this against the taxes and revenues for which I have voted. If every Member of the Congress were to do this—voting only for those items of expense which can be paid for out of the revenues he personally supports—debt reduction would become a simple matter.

It is well enough to say that increased debt is not hurtful today because our national production and total national income are so high. Since they are so high, is not this the more reason to pay for our needs from current income?

It is true enough that our public debt, as a percentage of our gross national product, is less than it was a few years ago. But perhaps more to the point, our public debt as related to our annual Federal revenues is growing ever higher.

What it comes to is that we in government must exercise the same self-restraints which are required of our individual American families. Obviously government costs more today than it did in the past. Our Nation has grown. The military demands are greater. Prices are up to the Government even as they are to the individual taxpayer.

But if we spend more, then we must take in more revenues and conduct our business on a pay-as-we-go basis. To the extent that we are not willing to pay this year for certain services, then we should forego them. We have done this in the highway program. We can do it in all things, certainly under the present conditions of a prosperous America and an expanding economy.

I am convinced that the American taxpayer would appreciate this. I am convinced that he wants to pay his way. I firmly believe that he does not want to continue amassing additional debt for his children to pay.

Walter Lippmann in his book, "The Public Philosophy" seriously raises the question as to whether our system, depending as it does upon public support for government policy, can survive the stresses and strains of a world grown suddenly small and keenly demanding. I say that it can.

The American people are worthy of our confidence. They do not want to be coddled or shielded from unpleasant fact. Tell them the truth, and they will respond. Call forth their best, and they will rise to the challenge.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Ford].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support the bill before us, calling for an increase in the debt limitation to \$300 billion. I would not have supported the proposed increase to \$308 billion. Unless unusual and unforeseen circumstances transpire between now and when we may be called upon to increase it to \$308 billion, I do not intend to support such an increase.

I concur with the observation made on page 7 in the committee report under the separate views of the Republicans on H.R. 10050. The pertinent sentence on that page, in my opinion, is the following and I quote:

An increase in the debt limitation would have been unnecessary if the administration had held nonmilitary expenditures within the amount estimated in the summer of 1961 when we voted the last increase in the debt limitation.

This statement I think is bolstered by another statement on page 9 of the minority views. This sentence reads as follows:

However, the military increase attributable to any military buildup which followed the original budget estimates for fiscal 1962 amounted to only \$2.2 billion.

This last statement tends to coincide with information contained in the January 31, 1962, daily statement of the U.S. Treasury. If you look at this daily statement for that date you will find that

for the 7 months of the current fiscal year as compared with the same 7-month period for the previous fiscal year, our military expenses, including military aid under the mutual assistance program, have gone up \$2 billion; whereas all other expenditures during the first 7 months' period for the same 2 fiscal years have gone up \$6.2 billion. This proves conclusively to me that at least 75 percent of the increase in expenditures in fiscal 1962 compared to 1961 were of a nonmilitary nature; therefore, this \$2 billion increase in the debt limitation will take care of the increased expenditures for the military contained in the original Eisenhower budget for fiscal 1962 and the three add-ons proposed by President Kennedy.

I want the record to show that starting with 1953 through 1961 I have consistently voted for all debt increases.

According to the record during this period there have been eight instances where there has been debt increase legislation. I supported President Kennedy's request last year. On June 26, 1961, on his request I voted for the increase.

It seems to me that if enough people such as myself, who have tried to be responsible in this area, forewarn the administration that we will not support an increase over and above this one, that they can make an honest and bona fide effort to curtail, restrict and limit non-defense expenditures; otherwise they will be faced with a situation which will not be to their liking.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. I certainly join in the gentleman's desire to make every possible effort to reduce our rate of spending, certainly in nondefense areas. I am sure that is the gentleman's position, but I would hope that my friend from Michigan, feeling as he does and I do, would not close his mind to what the situation may be in the next fiscal year, that is, not on the basis of increased rate of spending in the next fiscal year, but because of the fact that a deficit in a fiscal year has an effect on a succeeding fiscal year.

If the gentleman will look at the record, almost invariably a ceiling adjustment has to be made in the subsequent fiscal year to accommodate the deficit of the preceding fiscal year.

With respect to the 1963 fiscal year, we may be faced with the necessity of some upward adjustment in 1962, even though the rate of spending in that fiscal year is less than this fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas. I do understand the problem the gentleman presents. I fully realize that in the first 6 months of any fiscal year we traditionally have relatively lesser income and greater expenditures. However, this Congress has a responsibility to do all it can to hold down the availability of obligational author-

ity in all of the fiscal year 1963. In this way we can meet our responsibility. On the other hand the administration should be forewarned that there are many of us who try to be responsible; that this will be the last debt limitation increase I will support unless unforeseen circumstances arise.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman will agree with me, I am sure, that if defense spending and this lag we have referred to, that is, the deficit affecting the following fiscal year, were the causes of an increase, that would be one thing that might justify the gentleman's position. What the gentleman is calling attention to is, he does not want an increase in their ceiling in fiscal year 1963 as a result of increases in nondefense spending in 1963 compared to 1962. Is that correct?

Mr. FORD. That is correct. I fully appreciate some of the obligational authority which may be available in the fiscal year 1962, which was made available in the last session of the Congress, will not be reflected in expenditures until 1963. There is this lag, particularly in the procurement area. If the facts can be shown that that is the principal cause for another debt increase in fiscal 1963, I can understand the gentleman's position. But, on the other hand, we in this session of the Congress have an opportunity to control the nondefense expenditures area beginning in fiscal 1963, in the first 6 months, and into the second 6 months of this 12-month period.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

It was the desire of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means that we have more information in respect to the reaction of the Congress to the request made in the President's budget message before we did anything about a ceiling for the following fiscal year. It should be borne in mind this ceiling will have to go up if we finance these obligations and the Congress makes no reduction anywhere along the line.

Is that a fair statement?

Mr. FORD. I think you can argue that, but there are legislative proposals that will be before this Congress in the present session which will have an immediate impact on the expenditure picture, particularly in the fiscal year 1963 and carrying on through the years. If this Congress is serious about holding down the debt limitation, and I think many Members are, we must act responsibly in this area in the present session of the Congress.

Some can blithely go on voting for a lot of these legislative proposals that will reflect themselves in immediate cash expenditures early in fiscal 1963. I do not intend to do so. I am thinking, for example, right now of a new pay increase for 2,400,000-plus Federal employees. If we vote a pay increase for Government employees, that reflects itself promptly in cash expenditures. And, there are other similar examples.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I do not want to put any words in the Chairman's mouth, but as I understood him, the point was that if we follow out the request of the President as submitted to us in the budget message, we will have to vote the additional \$8 billion increase in the debt limit that the President has also asked for.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I do not object to having my friend from Wisconsin put words in my mouth, because he can better express those thoughts than I can myself. I certainly agree with what he said, provided that the estimates are wrong and the revenues are less. The ceiling would have to be higher.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. The point I want to make is that if we follow out the recommendations of the President as far as spending is concerned, and if there is not the increase in the revenues that is anticipated, you are not only going to have an \$8 billion further increase in the debt ceiling, but you are going to come in here for more increases and more increases in the ceiling, because every item of potential increase in revenue is preempted by increased spending, and even spending beyond that point by the new obligational authority requested.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. I wanted to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Michigan for taking the floor and expounding upon the other side of this budget ledger, the appropriations side. I am very hopeful that we establish in the Committee on Ways and Means the procedure, if this \$8 billion proposal comes before us, of inviting before our committee members of the Committee on Appropriations so that we can do the thorough job necessary in reviewing the budget with the Bureau of the Budget people and the Treasury people. We still have on the books, I believe, as the result of the Reorganization Act, this superduper committee that met twice, which is supposed to review the budget, composed of the Committees on Appropriations of the two branches and the House Committee on Ways and Means. But, it proved to be so unwieldy that it only met twice—and I suspected this—but I do believe the contribution that your people, the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] have made has amply brought that home to us, and the pertinent points he is making here, the need for being able to go into the appropriations and expenditures side, which the Committee on Ways and Means, of course, does not have the depth of experience that the appropriations people have.

I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Is the gentleman from Michigan acquainted with the budget expenditures by agency chart given us by the Treasury, wherein the military expenditures are listed as against civilian, showing increases? Under military we are told, as part of the military increases of expenditures, there is the Peace Corps, Export-Import Bank, Selective Service, U.S. Information Bureau, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Atomic Energy Commission—all of this as a part of the military as against civilian. And, on that type of a chart we see tremendous increases in military expenditures. Some of us on the committee went through this and took out of the military those functions that were not particularly military and put them in with the civilian, and we found that nonmilitary expenditures have gone up 60 percent but only 40 percent of those things related to the defense expenditures. Is that not in line with what the gentleman is telling us?

Mr. FORD. I think that is a somewhat different way of saying the same thing I tried to say a few minutes ago.

Mr. Chairman, may I conclude by saying this: I wish to commend the Committee on Ways and Means for coming in with the \$2 billion increase rather than requesting the \$10 billion increase recommended by President Kennedy, because it gives to us, that feel as I do, a chance to support this, based on what I believe is a bona fide increase in our military expenditures. On the other hand, it gives to us an opportunity to tell the executive branch of the Government and to perhaps forewarn our colleagues that in the next few months in this session of the Congress we have a serious fiscal responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, may I simply say again, as I said once before, the administration must act responsibly and the Congress must do likewise. I expect to vote in affirmative today, but my views in the future will be in the negative unless unforeseen circumstances arise.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FORRESTER].

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Chairman, during my service in Congress, the matter of raising the debt ceiling has arisen approximately nine times. I voted in favor of the raise on one or two occasions upon the premise that we would learn our lesson, and would be more careful with our expenditures and with the burdens we needlessly imposed upon future generations. I finally learned, however, that as long as we are willing to extend the debt limit, we will be faced with the necessity of doing so. If I thought we were ready to quit throwing away our future, I would be willing to vote for this raise this time, but I certainly do not intend to endorse huge indebtednesses that will whip us more surely than any foreign foe.

Just why we are asked to increase this debt limit only \$2 billion, I do not know, because all of us know that the President has stated that he wants the debt

ceiling increased to \$308 billion. If the present debt of \$290 billion were converted into silver dollars, it would require more than 25 million 1-ton trucks to haul it, according to the Washington Daily News of February 12, 1962.

That kind of indebtedness is absolutely startling. However, Mr. Stans, former Director of the Budget, says that our true indebtedness is over \$800 billion, not including "untold billions of dollars in guarantees by the Government on housing loans and other mortgages, bank deposits, and other savings, et cetera." He also says that the national debt is approximately \$22,000 for every family of four in this country.

Mr. Chairman, we now have a dollar whose value inflation has reduced to approximately 40 cents. The social security payments earned by our retirees, the pensions given our veterans, and commitments or responsibilities of our Government are placed in jeopardy because of this tremendous amount of debt. If our children are to have a sportsman's chance to maintain this Government, this profligate spending must stop and we must start living within our means plus paying some on our debts.

Some say that since we owe this money, we must vote to extend the debt limit. I believe in paying debts and, in fact, I insist on it. There is a weapon available for the administration to use to pay our debts and to make it unnecessary to follow this route which leads to bankruptcy and chaos. I refer to the route we hear so much of, to wit: Executive order. By Executive order, the President can cut the amounts of moneys to be expended so we can live within our means. That is what ought to be done and I hope he will do it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal this afternoon about our orbiting astronaut. I wish that with the same facility, the same expedition, and dedication Congress would get the Federal debt out of orbit. And I would recommend to the Committee on Ways and Means a study of how this business is conducted by the Committee on Space and Astronautics.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Arkansas.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, is my friend from Iowa inferring that the Committee on Ways and Means put this debt into orbit?

Mr. GROSS. I would have to be completely frank with the gentleman and say that as long as the committee brings bills to the House to increase the debt ceiling it is not offering much of an inducement to get the debt out of orbit.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. MILLS. The Committee on Ways and Means is not the committee that submits appropriations or authorization bills to the House; is that not true?

Mr. GROSS. The Committee on Ways and Means is the committee that brings debt-ceiling increase bills to the House.

Mr. MILLS. Is the gentleman saying that we control the situation?

Mr. GROSS. I am not saying that the committee controls the situation.

Mr. MILLS. I wanted to be clear on that.

Mr. GROSS. I am asking that the gentleman's committee offer a little help toward building a launching pad for the control and reduction of the Federal debt.

Responsibility has been discussed here a good deal this afternoon. What is the first responsibility? It ought to be to balance the budget and pay something on the debt, not to increase the debt ceiling. This is not responsible action, in my opinion.

Someone else described this as a debt management bill. How could an individual—and we are a government of individuals—manage his debts on any such basis as this?

I looked for the hearings on this bill. I should like to have read Secretary of the Treasury Dillon's statements before the Committee on Ways and Means but there was no hearings printed, and I cannot find out to what Mr. Dillon testified. I would like to know how he could square himself with his action last year in going down to Uruguay and pledging this country, without one scintilla of authority from the Congress of the United States, to spend \$20 billion on the so-called alliance for progress. I would like to know something about Mr. Dillon's responsibility for increasing the huge Federal debt and now his support for an increase in the debt ceiling.

Mr. Chairman, approval of this bill means that Congress has again rubber-stamped its approval of government by credit card. I should like to have had the opportunity to offer as an amendment the provisions of my bill, H.R. 144, to provide for an annual balanced budget and specific payments each year on the Federal debt.

As I stated previously, I am opposed to this legislation for the reason that it simply encourages the Government to plunge this Government ever deeper into debt, and because it is being considered under a gag rule which prohibits the offering of amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I think it is easy to hurl accusations of irresponsibility in this area, but I believe it is important that we keep the record straight.

In the first place, since the conclusion of World War II our national debt has remained substantially the same although it did increase about \$25 billion under the administration of former President Eisenhower. Nevertheless, in 1945 at the conclusion of World War II, our national debt was about \$300 billion. The proposal here today is that it be \$300 billion. As a matter of fact, when you look at the wealth of our country, in 1946 the gross national product of the United States was approximately \$300 billion. Today, the gross national product of the United States is approaching

\$600 billion. So that in essence, the amount owed by the United States has been reduced by 50 percent. The effect is the same as in the case of a man who earned \$5,000 owing \$5,000 as compared to a man owing \$5,000 and now earning \$10,000.

In addition to that, I think it only fair to say that the need for this increase is based almost entirely upon defense commitments that we had to make as a nation for our own security and these commitments were joined in by both parties for the Defense Establishment.

Today we are quite joyful and quite properly taking note of the fact that Colonel Glenn has orbited the earth three times, and that a few minutes ago it was reported that he was safely aboard the U.S. destroyer *Noa* south of Bermuda. Certainly, none of this would have been possible without the space program supported both by my Republican colleagues and by those of us on my side of the aisle. But this program meant an increase in appropriations last year of something over a billion dollars. My good friend, the gentleman from Iowa, talked about Secretary Dillon and his meeting in Latin America. I do not believe any person in this body really takes exception to a program which has for its goal the development of this area in the Western Hemisphere.

I listened to the report made here by my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], when he came back from a recent meeting in Latin America attended by our own Secretary of State and by other officials of the other governments on this continent. He made a very optimistic report. The gentleman from Alabama, with considerable documentation, gave us a very definite impression that we were making progress—real substantial progress in that area of the world. So I think it might be easy to criticize Secretary Dillon and the statements that he made to our good neighbors to the south, but I would hope that the program that they have joined in with enthusiastic cooperation will be a successful program. The point I am making, Mr. Chairman, is that this request for \$2 billion is made largely because of the defense commitments of the United States both in the area of space and in the Berlin situation and the situation in Laos and the situation in Vietnam and the necessity for maintaining a variety of commitments with respect to armed forces so that we can fight guerrilla tactics as well as nuclear warfare, and so on. In my judgment, the irresponsibility would be to vote against this bill rather than in voting for it, and I hope that the Committee on Ways and Means, which has considered this legislation carefully, will be sustained by the House. I know also, Mr. Chairman, that sometimes people come in and are critical of that committee, but I have had the privilege of being on that committee for many years. We approach these problems as best we can, and usually from the point of view of what we like to call fiscal responsibility.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I intend to vote against the increase in the public debt limit as proposed in H.R. 10050, and would like to state the reasons for my vote. It is not that I do not believe the U.S. Government should meet its commitments and pay its bills, but rather I want to use this means of protesting the continual expansion of Federal programs. At a time when the President is asking us to increase our expenditures for national security I feel we should be cutting back on domestic programs rather than enlarging them. In those instances where Congress deems it necessary that we enlarge our Federal responsibilities we should face up to the need for some sounder method of providing the funds than adding to the burden of debt we will pass on to the next generation.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DEVINE].

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but after listening to some remarks made by some of our illustrious colleagues I thought it well to get back to some figures in connection with the national debt. I imagine it would be considered the responsible thing to honor one's obligations, and I am sure my friends and supporters of this legislation feel likewise. Let us look at the figures. At the present time we have a national debt ceiling of \$298 billion. To the people in my district who do not understand big figures that is a tremendous amount of money. When you look at the budget submitted by the President of the United States, and I do not confine it to the present President, but to the last administration and others before that, you will find that the second largest item in the budget is the interest on the national debt. I believe at the present time it is \$9 billion a year. I do not understand what \$9 billion a year is except that it is a lot of money, and my people feel the same way, but to break that down not to a matter of months, not to a matter of weeks, nor to a matter of days, not to a matter of hours, but to a matter of minutes, what does it cost the American taxpayer every single minute of the day? It costs about \$17,000 a minute just to finance the interest on the national debt; and here we are today not considering reducing the national debt, but increasing it by \$2 billion temporarily. I understand the administration wants to take it up to \$308 billion, an all-time high in the history of this Nation.

I would think that if we did not grant this increase in the ceiling on the national debt, perhaps some of those who have been so free in voting for expenditures would think twice before they voted for them.

I have had a bill in Congress for some time, under the Eisenhower administration as well as the Kennedy administration, a bill that would require the President to take a percentage of the

anticipated revenues and apply it each year systematically to a reduction of the national debt. I had a hearing on that in the 86th Congress, but thus far in the 87th Congress I have not succeeded in having a hearing on my bill. This is not a matter personal to me alone, for there are 20 or 30 other Members on both sides of the aisle who are concerned in reducing the national debt rather than increasing it.

We must accept the responsibility of the heritage we will leave to our children, and the yet unborn generations.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN].

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill.

It is unfortunate that we must once again meet to consider raising this Nation's public debt limit. Many of us have repeatedly voiced our concern over deficit spending. We have been accused of a host of things, ranging from old fashioned thinking to obstructionism. It is with sadness that I observe the outcome of our concern; meetings such as this, when we must again decide whether or not an additional step toward financial bankruptcy will be our last.

I have noted, as have others, the Shakespearian inscription on the front of our National Archives. It says simply: "What is past is prologue." I have always been under the impression that we should build upon the past, not repeat its mistakes. But here we are again, considering another so-called "temporary" increase in our public debt limit. And from all indications, we will be here again before the year ends, considering an even further increase. We are now asked to increase the debt limit by \$2 billion, bringing the "temporary" limit to \$15 billion. We will be asked to increase it to \$23 billion to accommodate fiscal 1963. It seems there is nothing quite so permanent as these temporary increases.

My point is simply this: one of these days we will reach the point of no return. We may reach it today. We may reach it tomorrow. One thing is certain, if we refuse to learn from the past we will surely reach it eventually.

Let us consider the immediate past for a moment, in an effort to learn just why we are gathered this day to consider raising our debt limit. We, and our constituents, have been fed a steady diet of explanation. The main theme revolves around the Berlin crisis and the resulting military buildup. When you lower your waving flag long enough to see the cold figures on the wall you note that the revised budget for fiscal 1962 shows an overall increase in expenditures of \$8.2 billion over the original budget of the preceding administration. The absolute increase in expenditures for military personnel operations and procurement amounted to only \$2.2 billion. That leaves \$6 billion of additional expense that cannot be blamed on the Berlin crisis. The main crisis, it seems to me, is in the field of fiscal miscalculation if not irresponsibility.

In addition to threatening our economy by the all-too-easy method of deficit spending, we are weakening our position in the international arena. Since

last summer, imports have increased to record proportions. Our accounts payable in the world exceeded our accounts receivable by about \$19 billion. Right now we have only about \$17 billion in gold, of which \$12 billion is pledged to back up the money in circulation here at home. I shudder to think what would happen if our creditors demanded payment, since we simply could not pay it. We know from history that one of the major causes for a demand on our gold is a loss of confidence in the value of our currency. Round after round of temporarily increasing our public debt limit hardly instills much confidence anywhere.

It is evident once again that this consideration today could have been avoided by proper management and proper estimates. In a matter of months we will gather again to consider repairing the damages of another series of miscalculations. There is no assurance that the current budget proposals will fare any better.

I respectfully suggest this House look carefully at the immediate past and use it as a prolog to fiscal responsibility instead of a prelude to disaster.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY].

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for giving me this time, and I wish to state at the outset in voting against this bill that I have no criticism of the chairman nor the committee in bringing this bill before the House. In view of the expenditures made by this House in the past, it is incumbent upon the Committee on Ways and Means to present this matter to the House. Also, I would like to state that the Ways and Means Committee does not pass upon the appropriations and authorizations brought before this House for action.

But I will say to the distinguished chairman that I think it has been far too easy in the past to increase the limit on our national debt. I think this House has fallen into a bad habit of passing upon appropriations, not on the basis of our ability to pay for the programs, but with the theory and knowledge that this debt limit can be increased so easily.

Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who believes that there should be a systematic reduction of the national debt, and as some of my colleagues here have done, I introduced a bill to this effect.

This bill provides that there shall be included in each budget, an item requesting an appropriation equal to 1 percent of the debt outstanding to be used exclusively for retirement of this obligation. Even passage of this bill, Mr. Chairman, would be but a token effort toward retirement of this huge fiscal obligation, and a far cry from what I would like to see accomplished.

I would like to state emphatically that I am opposed to any further extension of the debt limit, and that is why I cast a "no" vote against the rule for considering this bill, and a "no" vote against the bill itself.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own

remarks at this point in the RECORD and that all Members desiring to do so may have that opportunity.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have asked the Bureau of the Budget to analyze the separate and minority views in the report on this bill. The Bureau's comments on those views follow:

Despite the arguments to the contrary, the facts since last June do amply support the proposed \$2 billion increase in debt limit for the current year. Starting with the testimony of last June 15 by the Secretary of the Treasury:

	Billion
1. The 1961 budget deficit actually turned out to be \$3.9 billion instead of \$2.5 billion, increasing the debt by.....	\$1.4
2. The Berlin crisis and congressional action in accord with President's proposal did increase defense spending in 1962.....	2.7
(The table on p. 9 of their views mentions \$2.2 billion, but it "forgot" to include other categories of defense spending—such as testing and developing weapons and strengthening our civil defense.)	
3. Other increases in defense spending to increase our readiness and our longrun military capability.....	.2
4. Net increase in spending by the Department of Agriculture, mainly reflecting support payments on a larger harvest than had been expected.....	.7
5. Increased expenditures because of Congress' unwillingness to raise postal rates as the President and the Secretary recommended.....	.7
6. Interest on the public debt, mainly because of higher market interest rates and also because of somewhat higher debt, is now estimated to be more than last June's estimate by.....	.3
7. All other changes in estimated 1962 budget expenditures since last June net to.....	— .5
(This takes account of appropriation actions of Congress not approving President's education proposals, and all other changes. Total budget expenditures for 1962 are now estimated to be \$89.1 billion compared to \$85 billion last June 15.)	
8. Therefore, the larger 1961 deficit (\$1.4 billion), and the increased 1962 expenditures listed above (totaling \$4.1 billion)—of which the Berlin buildup is the largest single item—total.....	5.5

The Secretary's request for an immediate increase of \$2 billion therefore does indeed seem conservative, and—as he stated to the committee—he will have to return for a larger increase later in this session of the Congress. (This is also true because of the seasonal nature of revenue collection, which has not been mentioned here.)

As to the comment in the separate views that: "During the stewardship of this administration, the projected rate of expenditures by the Federal Government has increased by more than \$1 billion per month and is still increasing," this figure is apparently calculated by comparing the \$78.9 billion estimate of 1961 expenditures in the Eisenhower budget, and the 1963 expenditure estimate of \$92.5 billion in the Kennedy budget of a year later.

Thus: $\frac{\$92.5 \text{ billion} - \$78.9 \text{ billion}}{12} = \frac{\$13.6}{12}$
 = "more than \$1 billion per month."

This calculation thus includes two types of change: (1) The change from an Eisenhower to a Kennedy budget; and (2) the passage of time from 1961 to 1963.

What accounts for this \$13.6 billion figure?

Actual expenditures in 1961 were not \$78.9 billion, as President Eisenhower estimated in January 1961, but \$81.5 billion. The \$2,531 million increase reflects a \$561 million increase in Department of Defense expenditures for the programs in the January budget (rather than program changes); an increase of \$143 million because postal rates were not increased effective April 1, 1961, as assumed in the Eisenhower budget; an increase of \$498 million for temporary extended unemployment benefits; a further increase of \$890 million in Department of Defense expenditures reflecting program changes and accelerated procurement; a \$215 million increase in Department of Agriculture expenditures; and \$224 million net increase in all other programs.

The \$11 billion increase from actual expenditures for fiscal 1963 is accounted for as follows:

	Billion
National defense	\$5.2
International affairs and finance5
Space research and technology	1.7
Subtotal	7.4
Interest on the national debt4
Subtotal	7.8
Domestic civil functions	13.0
Civilian pay reform2
Allowance for contingencies2
Total	\$11.0

¹ Breakdown shown on p. 10 of the budget.

² Detail do not add to total due to rounding.

Present estimate of fiscal 1962 budget expenditures and January 1961 estimate of previous administration (the \$8.2 billion referred to in the separate views on page 9 of committee report.)

	Fiscal 1962, in billions
1. January 1961 estimate	\$80.9

This estimate understated the expenditure effect of the proposals it included by \$0.4 billion, as shown by the President and the Budget Director last March. Even ignoring that part, however, where are the increases since then?

2. Present estimate	89.1
Difference	8.2

This includes:

Department of Defense, military functions and military assistance (\$44.7 to \$48.3)	3.6
National Aeronautics and Space Administration (\$1.0 to \$1.3)3
Interest (\$8.6 to \$9.0)4
Unenacted postal rates7
Antirecession actions mainly temporary extended unemployment benefits, as approved by the Congress5
Department of Agriculture, mainly for price support costs due to greater crops than anticipated (\$5.8 to \$7.2 billion)	1.4
Housing and Home Finance Agency, reflecting the legislation enacted by the Congress in its last session (\$0.5 to \$0.9)4
Public assistance grants by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (\$2.3 to \$2.6)3
National Institutes of Health, reflecting congressional increases in appropriations (\$0.5 to \$0.8)3
All other changes3

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have voted against far more than \$2 billion in unnecessary and wasteful Government spending; therefore, to be consistent, I must vote against this effort to raise the debt limit in order to spend this amount.

Additionally, when we fix a debt limit we have in mind there may be special situations arising which call for unexpected expenditures. The amount of the limit is calculated with that in mind. It is the obligation of the President to restrict less urgent expenditures if such unexpected contingencies bring expenditures close to the limit. That is the reason for the limit. If we do not stick to it, the whole matter of debt ceilings becomes a meaningless exercise. Naturally, when a real national emergency occurs, some exception might be made. I do not regard the mishandling of the Berlin crisis as such a national emergency, even though the fact that it was mishandled should be a subject of considerable national apprehension.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Arkansas yield me a minute?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. We have just heard the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Boggs] expound on the subject of the gross national product. We had quite a substantial gross national product even in the depths of the 1930 depression. The gross national product is a statistic, and that is all it is. I can give you another statistic. The human body is approximately 2 percent skin. I suppose because it is 2 percent skin that you could skin the gentleman from Louisiana and it would not hurt him too much.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the bill is considered as having been read for amendment. No amendment is in order except those offered by the Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any committee amendments?

Mr. MILLS. There are no committee amendments, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises. Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. JENNINGS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 10050, to provide for a further temporary increase in the public debt limit set forth in the Second Liberty Bond Act, pursuant to House Resolution 549, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 251, nays 144, answered "present" 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 18]

YEAS—251

Addonizio	Gilbert	Nix
Albert	Glenn	Norblad
Arends	Gonzalez	Norrell
Ashley	Granahan	O'Brien, Ill.
Aspinall	Gray	O'Brien, N.Y.
Avery	Green, Oreg.	O'Hara, Ill.
Ayres	Green, Pa.	Olsen
Bailey	Griffin	O'Neill
Baker	Griffiths	Osmers
Baldwin	Hagan, Ga.	Ostertag
Barrett	Hagen, Calif.	Patman
Barry	Halleck	Perkins
Bass, N.H.	Halpern	Peterson
Bates	Hansen	Pfost
Beckworth	Harding	Philbin
Betts	Hardy	Pilcher
Blatnik	Harris	Pirnie
Boggs	Harrison, Va.	Poage
Boland	Harvey, Mich.	Powell
Bolling	Healey	Price
Bolton	Hobert	Pucinski
Brademas	Hechler	Purcell
Breeding	Hemphill	Quile
Brewster	Henderson	Rains
Brooks	Herlong	Randall
Buckley	Hollifield	Reifel
Burke, Ky.	Holland	Reuss
Byrne, Pa.	Ichord, Mo.	Rhodes, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.	Inouye	Rivers, Alaska
Cahill	Jarman	Rivers, S.C.
Cannon	Jennings	Roberts, Ala.
Carey	Joelson	Roberts, Tex.
Celler	Johnson, Calif.	Rodino
Chelf	Johnson, Wis.	Rogers, Colo.
Chenoweth	Jones, Ala.	Rooney
Clark	Judt	Roosevelt
Coad	Karsten	Rostenkowski
Cohelan	Karth	Roush
Conte	Kastenmeier	Ryan
Cook	Kee	St. Germain
Cooley	Keith	Santangelo
Corbett	Kelly	Saund
Corman	Keogh	Saylor
Curtin	King, Calif.	Schneebeli
Curtis, Mo.	King, Utah	Seranton
Daddario	Kluczyński	Seely-Brown
Daniels	Kowalski	Selden
Davis, John W.	Kunkel	Shelley
Davis, Tenn.	Lane	Sheppard
Dawson	Lankford	Shipley
Delaney	Lesinski	Sikes
Dent	Libonati	Sisk
Denton	Lindsay	Slack
Diggs	McDowell	Smith, Iowa
Dingell	McFall	Smith, Miss.
Donohue	McIntire	Spence
Downing	Macdonald	Stafford
Doyle	Mack	Steed
Dulski	Madden	Stubblefield
Dwyer	Mahon	Sullivan
Edmondson	Mailhard	Teague, Calif.
Elliott	Marshall	Thomas
Everett	Martin, Mass.	Thompson, Tex.
Evins	Mathias	Thornberry
Fallon	Matthews	Toll
Farbstein	May	Trimble
Fascell	Meador	Tupper
Feighan	Miller, Clem	Udall, Morris K.
Fenton	Miller,	Ullman
Finnegan	George P.	Vanik
Fino	Milliken	Van Zandt
Flood	Mills	Vinson
Flynt	Montoya	Wallhauser
Fogarty	Moorhead, Pa.	Walter
Ford	Morgan	Weiss
Fountain	Morris	Westland
Frazier	Morrison	Wickersham
Frelinghuysen	Morse	Wildnall
Friedel	Moss	Wilson, Calif.
Gallagher	Multer	Yates
Garland	Murphy	Young
Garmatz	Murray	Younger
Gary	Natcher	Zablocki
Glamo	Nedzi	Zelenko

NAYS—144

Abbott	Durno	Nelsen
Abernethy	Findley	Nygaard
Adair	Fisher	Passman
Alexander	Forrester	Pelly
Alford	Gathings	Pike
Alger	Gavin	Pillion
Andersen,	Goodell	Poff
Minn.	Goodling	Ray
Anderson, Ill.	Gross	Reece
Andrews	Haley	Robison
Ashbrook	Hall	Rogers, Fla.
Ashmore	Harrison, Wyo.	Rogers, Tex.
Auchincloss	Harsha	Roudebush
Baring	Harvey, Ind.	Rousset
Battin	Hiestand	Rutherford
Becker	Hoeven	St. George
Beermann	Hoffman, Ill.	Schadeberg
Belcher	Horan	Schenck
Bell	Hosmer	Scherer
Bennett, Fla.	Hull	Schweiker
Berry	Jensen	Schwengel
Blitch	Johansen	Scott
Bonner	Jonas	Short
Bow	Jones, Mo.	Shriver
Bromwell	Kearns	Siler
Brown	Kilgore	Smith, Calif.
Broyhill	King, N.Y.	Smith, Va.
Bruce	Knox	Staggers
Burleson	Kornegay	Stephens
Casey	Kyl	Taber
Cederberg	Laird	Taylor
Chamberlain	Langen	Teague, Tex.
Chiperfield	Latta	Thompson, La.
Church	Lennon	Thomson, Wis.
Clancy	Lipscomb	Tollefson
Collier	McCulloch	Tuck
Colmer	McDonough	Utt
Cramer	McMillan	Van Pelt
Cunningham	McSweeney	Waggonner
Curtis, Mass.	McVey	Weaver
Dague	MacGregor	Whalley
Davis,	Martin, Nebr.	Wharton
James C.	Mason	Whitener
Derounian	Michel	Whitten
Derwinski	Minshall	Williams
Devine	Moeller	Wilson, Ind.
Dole	Moore	Wright
Dominick	Moorehead,	
Dorn	Ohio	
Dowdy	Mosher	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Kilburn

NOT VOTING—38

Addabbo	Hays	O'Hara, Mich.
Anfuso	Hoffman, Mich.	O'Konski
Bass, Tenn.	Huddleston	Rhodes, Ariz.
Bennett, Mich.	Johnson, Md.	Riehlman
Boykin	Kirwan	Sibal
Bray	Kitchin	Springer
Broomfield	Landrum	Stratton
Burke, Mass.	Loser	Thompson, N.J.
Dooley	Magnuson	Watts
Ellsworth	Morrow	Willis
Fulton	Miller, N.Y.	Winstead
Grant	Monagan	
Gubser	Moulder	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Kirwan for, with Mr. Kitchin against.
 Mr. Hays for, with Mr. Moulder against.
 Mr. Monagan for, with Mr. O'Konski against.
 Mr. Bennett of Michigan for, with Mr. Bray against.
 Mr. Anfuso for, with Mr. Fulton against.
 Mr. Ellsworth for, with Mr. Broomfield against.
 Mr. Miller of New York for, with Mr. Gubser against.
 Mr. Sibal for, with Mr. Rhodes of Arizona against.
 Mr. Addabbo for, with Mr. Hoffman of Michigan against.
 Mr. Riehlman for, with Mr. Kilburn against.
 Mr. Thompson of New Jersey for, with Mr. Springer against.
 Mr. O'Hara of Michigan for, with Mr. Willis against.
 Mr. Johnson of Maryland for, with Mr. Winstead against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Morrow.
 Mr. Loser with Mr. Dooley.

Mr. PASSMAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, I have a live pair with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], who is at Cape Canaveral. Had he been present he would have voted "yea." I therefore withdraw my vote of "nay" and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so and who spoke on the bill just passed may be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

TRANSFER OF SPECIAL ORDER FROM TODAY TO TOMORROW

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] may have permission to transfer his special order from today until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

COLONEL GLENN'S ORBITAL FLIGHT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOOREHEAD], and myself, I have the honor of submitting a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. CON. RES. 431

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby extends its congratulations and warm good wishes to Lieutenant Colonel John H. Glenn, Junior, United States Marine Corps, of New Concord, Ohio, on behalf of the people of the United States, and commends him for his personal courage, skill, and dedication in the cause of scientific achievement in his successful and epochmaking three orbital flights around the earth on February 20, 1962.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in submitting this resolution on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOOREHEAD] and myself, I know I am responding to the wishes of every Member of the House on both sides of the aisle.

The American people are tremendously proud of this great accomplishment upon the part of one of their own.

Flying on wings of courage and devotion, Col. John Glenn today has joined the immortal sons of this Republic.

In his feat there was something of Columbus when he crossed the Atlantic. There was something of the Pilgrim who faced the dangers of the wilderness and the Red man. There was something of the daring and devotion of the men who followed Washington at Valley Forge. There was something of the pioneer who turned back the frontier and built this Republic. There was something of Lindbergh crossing the Atlantic.

Colonel Glenn's accomplishment was one of the most heroic efforts in the history of man.

But this great flight was more than a manifestation of personal courage—this was a great scientific achievement. It is part of the opening door to the future potential of the human race. It is proof again of the quality of American science. It is a tribute to the American classroom and to the laboratory. This flight places our country in the forefront of the most spectacular and most modern of all the sciences.

Mr. Speaker, I was one of those privileged this morning to be with the President and Vice President of the United States, and our distinguished Speaker, when they were watching the blast-off of Colonel Glenn on the television. I sensed there among the most eminent men of our country that through their minds ran a feeling of confidence in the quality of our space efforts and in their hearts was an earnest prayer that the Heavenly Father would accompany Colonel Glenn in his historic flight. It must have been the same with every man, woman, and child in America and with every God-fearing person around the world.

When the first firm tones of Colonel Glenn came back there was reassurance that here was a man who could do the job.

Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal pleasure that I have this opportunity on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOOREHEAD] from whose district this great American has come, to offer this resolution and to ask for its unanimous passage at this time.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOOREHEAD of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure that the gentleman from Oklahoma joins me in accepting this resolution. I realize that the parliamentary procedure is unusual,

but I am very grateful for the interest and active support of the leadership on both sides of the aisle in this resolution. I am immensely pleased that within minutes of the completion of the successful orbital flight of Lt. Col. John H. Glenn, Jr., we can consider official recognition of it here.

It is my honor to represent the area in southeastern Ohio where both Lieutenant Colonel Glenn and his charming wife were born and grew up. New Concord, Ohio, is still their hometown. It is also the residence of the parents of John Glenn.

Every American will remember this exciting day. Astronaut Glenn's feat is both a personal triumph and a spectacular demonstration of America's progress in space technology. In this, free men everywhere rejoice for the long stride forward in scientific advancement.

I believe that we are expressing the will of the people of the United States in this resolution. The deep respect and affection we hold for John Glenn is apparent. The intrepid spirit of this man, his fellow astronauts, and all of those whose soaring imaginations made possible this flight are deserving of the honors they receive. I urge that we consider and agree to this resolution now as a token of the Nation's gratitude for the memorable events we have witnessed today and to the man whose personal courage and skill contributed so largely to its success.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I desire now to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, naturally, we on the Committee on Science and Astronautics are delighted with the success that was achieved today in sending a man into orbit and recovering him in the fine manner in which it was done. However, I would like to point out to the House that this was in no way a stunt or an exhibition. It was rather, as the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] told you, a great contribution to science. What we have seen today was a scientific experiment whose end object was not the entertainment of the people of this country and the world, although it means a lot to us in international prestige. That was not its end object, either. Its end object is to wrest from space her secrets that can be used for the betterment of mankind. The space age today is in the same relative position that the airplane was some 10 years after the Wright brothers made their historic flight at Kittyhawk. I am sure they could not at that time anticipate that you could cross the continent in 3½ hours as the result of the work that they were doing. We know that in the space field there are certain very positive accomplishments that will contribute to our welfare, and this is the most challenging field in science today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in paying my tribute to Colonel Glenn and to the astronauts who preceded him. They

will go down in the records with great Americans who have made great contributions to science, some of them even at the cost of their lives.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California and the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and that all those who have spoken on this subject today may revise and extend their remarks and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject matter of this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRUCE].

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I have perhaps more than ordinary interest in the feat of Col. John Glenn and in the experiences that he and his wife have gone through, having attended college with John and his wife, Annie.

I think this morning as this attempt was about to be made, we felt many of the emotions much more keenly, perhaps, than others because of our association with them in years past.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply say this: That while this is a great feat, a scientific accomplishment, the man that is John Glenn is even a greater feat. As I watched him on some of the television appearances when any ordinary man would have been under tremendous emotional pressures, the calmness of John certainly was an inspiration to every American. I remember one question that was asked him at one of those press conferences and it was this: Whether or not he had said any special prayers in regard to what he was about to undertake. His reply was, "No; he and his wife tried to live day by day the religious and spiritual convictions which they had held from childhood."

Mr. Speaker, I think it is these qualities in John Glenn which make us even more proud today of the accomplishments that he has achieved for the United States and for the field of science—the qualities of the man which are the qualities of greatness. I am just simply proud to say that I have known him.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join in support of this resolution. I am sure that all Americans are extremely proud of the great accomplishment of Colonel Glenn in his orbital flight today.

Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last weekend to be at Cape Canaveral and to see the absolutely fantastic preparations that were being made there for further probes of outer space. I think that the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, and the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House,

the gentleman from California [Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER] were quite proper in pointing out that the real meaning of today's accomplishment is its great contribution to science. There is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the successful flight of Colonel Glenn today spells for all Americans a virtual avalanche of new space accomplishments by our Nation in the very near future.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing, though, that I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House which I have not heard or seen mentioned so far today: Unlike the secret flights into space that allegedly have been conducted by the Soviet Union, today at Cape Canaveral there were three official representatives of the Federation Aeronautique Internationale, which has its headquarters in Paris, and which is the worldwide international agency that has been established and is recognized as the official judge for all claims to speed records and space accomplishments. One of those three observers was actually up there at the top of the gantry; he actually saw Colonel Glenn get into the capsule and watched the launching of the capsule. Certainly, unlike the long and serious speculation that has existed surrounding the Soviet claims of space penetration, there can be absolutely no question about the great accomplishment of our American astronaut today and the men and women of science who made this possible. These international on-the-spot observers need not engage in any speculation about the veracity of Colonel Glenn's flight into space even though the federation has every right to question the Soviet claims because of the meager information the Russians have released about their flights.

It is of great significance to me that the Kremlin has released virtually meaningless data in support of the Gagarin flight and practically no information in its application for recognition by the FAI of the Titov flight. It would not surprise me if the Kremlin now took the scientific data gained today from Colonel Glenn's orbital flight and used it to beef up the Soviet report on the Titov flight which I understand the Soviet Union must file by May 11.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me very significant that in our free society we are not afraid to expose our failures and our disappointments, but by the same token we are proud to show to the world our accomplishments. There is no doubt in my mind that in adopting this resolution today and in paying tribute to Colonel Glenn we are in fact paying tribute to the ingenuity and the resourcefulness of the American people.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy, indeed, to join with my colleagues from Ohio, in particular, and with all of my colleagues, in general, who have something to say about the epochal accomplishment of Colonel Glenn. I am

boasting a bit when I remind the Members of the House that my great State of Ohio was first in electric light—first in air flight—and now first in space flight.

Colonel Glenn is, of course, a man of great ability and courage, in the best tradition of America. We have proof, if any be needed anywhere, in this well planned and perfectly executed space flight that anything that any country can do, we can do better.

Mr. Speaker, I think it should be said again, and again, and again, that we live in the greatest country in all the world, in the strongest country in all the world, and when the United States of America determines that there is something to be done, it will be done.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I join with our great majority leader in extolling the virtues of Colonel Glenn. But as ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor I would like to say this—I would like to pay tribute, on the floor of the House this afternoon, to all those men who took care of every detail of every meticulous operation that made it possible for Colonel Glenn to be the No. 1 hero of the United States of America today.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, words cannot fully describe the feeling that today is in the hearts and minds of people throughout the United States of America because of the space achievement of Col. John Glenn.

Suffice it to say it is a feeling of deep pride and quiet jubilation.

Through the achievement of Colonel Glenn the United States has arrived foursquare on the space scene. He deserves each and every accolade that has been paid him and which will be bestowed upon him in the days to come.

His was a feat of dedication, courage, fortitude, brilliance, and determination. We, as a nation, owe him an everlasting debt.

And, as a nation, we also owe undying gratitude and thanks to the thousands upon thousands of people who helped make this achievement possible and thoroughly successful. It was a demonstration of a nation's skill and teamwork as the astronaut, the mechanic, the laborer, the scientist, the sailor, the soldier, the airman, the marine, and the white-collar worker all pulled together in a common cause.

On behalf of the people of the 12th Congressional District of New Jersey, I offer my thanks and congratulations to Colonel Glenn and his many teammates.

Mr. CURTIN. Mr. Speaker, the heroic flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn today was a monumental achievement of which America can be justly proud. We can also be proud of the fact that all phases of the project were done openly and with complete publicity. The flight was a triumph not only to Colonel Glenn but also to the scientists, engineers, and technicians who worked on the project.

Colonel Glenn has the admiration of all of us, not only because of his patience and steady nerves in the face of many

postponements, but also because of his complete mastery of his vehicle in space and his splendid demeanor after the successful conclusion of his flight.

We give thanks for Colonel Glenn's safe return, and we are also tremendously grateful for the very definite knowledge that his epochal flight gave to us as this Nation moves ever further into the conquest of outer space.

There is little more that I can add to what has already been said in praise of this wonderful American. As long as we have men like him in this great country of ours, we need never fear for its future.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I thank all those who have taken a part in these proceedings.

We all are grateful to Colonel Glenn for what he has done this day for his country. We are grateful to the loyal and brave family that has stood behind him—to his wife and children whose prayers were with him during every minute of his flight. The courage they demonstrated during the long months of training, and during the many frustrations which preceded the flight, has been in all respects exemplary.

We are grateful to all those who had a hand in the preparations that preceded the flight itself.

We salute our great space agency and all its personnel for a job well done.

We extend our congratulations also to the distinguished Speaker of the House who was chairman of the Select Committee on Science and Astronautics and under whose leadership the space agency was created.

We salute the wonderful men and women of our Armed Forces.

The tremendous recovery job performed by the U.S. Navy is another example of the quality of our men in uniform.

The coordination among all branches of Government who participated in this flight is indicative of the quality of teamwork of which our people are capable when a big job needs to be done.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our great fellow American, Colonel Glenn, his wife, and children, and all who had supporting roles in this orbital flight. I thank God for watching over him and allowing this great scientific accomplishment. It has opened another door to tomorrow.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the district from which Colonel Glenn took off this morning I certainly want to join the rest of the Members in congratulating him and expressing my deep and sincere appreciation to him for his dedication and devotion; and also to the many, many other people who joined with him, especially the people from our district, in making this magnificent feat possible.

ASTRONAUT GLENN'S GLOBAL ORBIT GREAT ACHIEVEMENT—NO STUNT

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a great day for the United States and all Americans. The spirit, courage, determination, and patience of Colonel Glenn will now blaze a new trail in our space efforts. The entire Nation and the world congratulates Astronaut Glenn for his magnificent achievement and felicitations go out to his wonderful and loving family.

The great fields of science and technology can take pride in the great accomplishment of this day in outer space. This was no stunt. Astronaut Glenn's global orbit opened up for the eyes of the world to see and the ears of the world to hear what the United States has done in space technology. This was so different in comparison to the manner in which the Soviet Union carried out their efforts in space exploration. The world was kept in darkness and in ignorance until the Soviet Cosmonauts landed amid the press furies from Moscow.

PRICE TAG HIGH BUT TAXPAYERS' MONEY WELL SPENT

Mr. Speaker, we tip our hat to Colonel Glenn, his family, to the scientists and technicians, to the designers, planners, draftsmen, to the long line of men and women standing behind this great successful earth orbit of today. As a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee that appropriates funds to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, for this and other projects, I know that the price for space success is high but I can assure the American taxpayers that today's achievement was well worth the price tag because it has ended the gap between the United States and the Soviet Union in space explorations. The Soviets started long before we did and the United States has caught up to them in 4 short years. This is certainly a tribute to American ingenuity and capability. Today's success will hasten the United States toward the objective set last year by President Kennedy of placing an American on the moon in the decade of the sixties.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I shall ask for just a few minutes of the time of the House today, but those of us who are on the House Space Committee might well be pardoned for making a few observations for the RECORD on this very historic day of February 20, 1962.

Along with everyone else in America, those of us on the committee are elated at the complete success of today's Mercury-Atlas MA-6.

This event marks a significant milestone in our space program. Today, even more than at the time of the sub-orbital success of Commander Shepard, proves the favorable result of years of dedicated effort by thousands of people throughout our Nation who have contributed to Project Mercury.

While this event is certainly significant in itself, and taken alone will always stand out as a major achievement in astronautics by the free world, it is even more important in that it provides the springboard for the following generations of manned spacecraft which in

present contemplation will be named Projects Gemini and Apollo.

It was our great privilege to personally meet and visit with Colonel Glenn during the time of our visit to the cape on the morning of Commander Shepard's flight into space. Because of his alertness then and endless enthusiasm we could almost sense that he would ultimately be chosen for our first orbital effort.

Several members of the committee last week sweat out each day's delay—first, on Wednesday, then last Thursday, and finally, last Friday—and had to return to the city of Washington because of the legislative program this week. I am certain everyone of us experienced deep regret today in having to forgo a direct view of this most historic event.

But there were some critics last week, and there were even some critics within the last day or two who were quoted as saying that this entire operation should be described as a "plumber's nightmare." Let us admit very quickly that the liquid propulsion system is complex and does involve a lot of valves and tubing and pressure devices, but this success today proves that we are making progress, even in liquid propulsion systems and the success of this shot, coupled with the degree of accuracy and reliability of control of the capsule, should prove that this operation was anything but a "plumber's nightmare," and instead was a carefully planned, perfectly executed project from countdown to recovery and should serve to classify such irresponsible critics into their proper category.

Mr. Speaker, it is my humble prediction that this will be a great year for our space program, and that we will experience many more successes before the end of this calendar year. We will most likely see flights of multiple orbit, and perhaps even a flight that will remain in full orbit for a 24-hour period.

If I may, I would like to take a moment to comment on the many previous delays that have gone on since December and all through January, and to point out that there was some impatience developing across the country—and on this I think we should remember that we set up for the world to see in a great showcase how we in America and the free world value a human life. It would have been easy to have sent Colonel Glenn into orbit based upon weather conditions at Cape Canaveral many times before today, but our concern was about the condition of the sea in the recovery areas. It was not simply a question of showing to the world that we could orbit a man, but the United States had equal concern for the protection of the life of one of its citizens. In my opinion, this was a great demonstration to the world that one life here in America is without limit as to its value, and this brings us to the concurrent wonder, and even suspicion, concerning some of the press releases and stories of purported Russian successes and particularly points up the slight value that is placed upon the life of one of their astronauts behind the Iron Curtain. The many delays and the great caution and care taken as to all phases of this project to preserve the life of

our astronaut are just further proof of some of the good things in our American way of life, in sharp contrast to that of the secrecy behind the Iron Curtain.

At the time of the Shepard flight, it was our privilege and pleasure to ride back from Cape Canaveral to the city of Washington on the same plane with the head of Federation Aeronautique Internationale, a native of France, whose assignment was to journey to the United States to check upon and certify the suborbital flight. Today, again, at Cape Canaveral, a representative of this same organization mounted the gantry and personally saw Colonel Glenn sealed in the capsule, so to be able to make positive certification to the world that this orbital flight was commenced at Cape Canaveral and was subsequently checked upon throughout its three orbits by representatives of the organization. There were other representatives at the scene of the recovery 200 miles northwest of Puerto Rico.

We are proud today of this achievement and we can proudly say to the world that here is an event which actually happened. There is no make-believe, nothing to hide, everything is an open book, and if there are those who need to be convinced, we can call upon these neutral observers of the only organization in the world whose primary function it is to certify to feats of aviation and astronautics who were present and will put their imprimatur on all of the events preceding, during, and following this epochal event. Reflect for just a moment on what a difference there is in our way of doing things from that of the Russians, both as to the Gagarin and the Titov flights, with some quite apparent inconsistencies in their announcements of these two flights and even some conflicting explanations as to exactly what happened.

In talking with our family in the home city of Independence, Mo., today, we learned that the streets were deserted, and that every person in town was literally chained to his TV set, so absorbing was the interest. We guess this has been true today all over America, and rightly it should be. Our information from home but proves the truth of the admonition that we saw at Cape Canaveral last week on the marquees, and on dozens of signs on the fronts of business places, and in the front yards of residences at Cocoa Beach, Cocoa, and Titusville, in these words:

Colonel Glenn, the hopes and the prayers of the free world are with you.

Mr. Speaker, after the elapsed time of 4 hours, 56 minutes, and 26 seconds, when the Mercury capsule had settled into the Atlantic Ocean about 200 miles northwest of Puerto Rico and was followed by the successful recovery of our Col. John H. Glenn, we have a feeling that when this word was flashed throughout the world, there may have been some long faces in the Kremlin, because the Russians should now know that America is in this space race to stay, and to win and that we will have other space spectaculars in this calen-

dar year of 1962 to prove that the free world can maintain its leadership in space. Today is a historic day, but also a happy day for those thousands who have contributed to this successful effort, and a day of great joy throughout the free world.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, every American is prouder today of his country, his flag, and his great heritage, as a result of the heroic achievement of Lt. Col. John Glenn.

While this resolution salutes Colonel Glenn, it is well to remember that this brave marine's accomplishment was the result of tremendous and unparalleled teamwork on the part of many thousands of his fellow Americans.

This great team has included not only the dedicated men and women of NASA and our combined Armed Forces, but additional thousands of engineers, scientists, technicians, production planners, and managers, and working men and women who have backed up and made possible the colonel's splendid orbital flight.

It is another great illustration of what Americans can accomplish when hands are joined so firmly and strongly in a united effort for our country.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and privileged to speak in support of this resolution and urge its immediate unanimous adoption in order to commemorate one of the greatest days in the history of this great country.

Virtually before the eyes and ears of the whole world, the successful orbital flight of Lt. Col. John Glenn today renews the faith of our people and restores the confidence of our allies in the capability of the United States to compete in space exploration.

The open and complete revelation and account of all aspects of this flight is in marked contrast to the deliberate secrecy of the Soviet Union on similar occasions and should add even greater prestige to this wonderful space feat.

The congratulations and heartfelt thanks of all Americans go out to Colonel Glenn and every individual who helped to make this scientific achievement possible. We join in saluting the magnificent courage of Mrs. Glenn and the two Glenn children who have consistently exemplified the traditional pioneering spirit upon which this great Nation was founded and which will sustain it forever against any and every challenge of the future.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, like millions of other Americans, I watched the takeoff of *Friendship 7* spaceship with considerable anxiety. I listened to the reports of the flight, and finally saw the successful recovery. Together with the legions who have watched and listened to the progress of the flight, I am pleased and proud.

We have made a tremendous step in the direction of successful manned space flights. Colonel Glenn's accomplishment today will have a large impact on the U.S. position in the world.

I am proud of our Nation's accomplishment—and especially since it was performed in full view of the entire

world. While many persons continue to doubt whether the celebrated Soviet cosmonauts Gagarin and Titov ever left the ground, we, and the whole world, know that Colonel Glenn was out there in space, went around the earth three times, and came back safely.

My sincere congratulations to Colonel Glenn, his fellow astronauts, and our team of scientists and technicians who made this feat possible. Their efforts, and their success, will serve as an inspiration along the long road that still lies ahead.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. Speaker, this is a great day for America. I am filled with great pride and emotion when I try to speak of the triumphant feat of Col. John Glenn and his orbital flight three times around the earth today; however, I want to join our distinguished Speaker and majority leader and my colleagues in the Congress in paying tribute to this great American and to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and all those connected with the tremendous accomplishment performed in outer space. It will long be remembered that today's successful flight into outer space will be but the beginning of great scientific advancement in this field. Our minds go back to the days of the Wright Brothers at Kitty Hawk when airplane flight was in its infancy and we can review the tremendous progress made in this field. Considering the great potential of outer space exploration, I believe we can look forward to the future with great hope and expectation in finding ways of promoting this great scientific advancement for peace and well-being of all our peoples. To Col. John Glenn and his fine family I want to express my profound sense of appreciation for what I know has been a trying period for them during the 10 postponements of this magnificent venture.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to the many today who are congratulating Lt. Col. John Glenn and the Mercury space team on their truly outstanding accomplishment of three successful orbital flights of the earth.

This was not only a truly successful triumph of man over the oft competing forces of nature, but it was also a vindication of our open society which permits the world to view our failures and our successes.

We have now taken an open and significant step forward in our further understanding of the universe in which we live, and once again, my warmest congratulations to those dedicated men and women who did so much to make successful this remarkable exploration of space.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with my colleagues of the House in expressing congratulations to Col. John Glenn on his historic achievement and to the thousands of men and women, both in civilian life and of the military, who proved by extraordinary teamwork the manner in which Americans work together in accomplishing a desirable objective.

Colonel Glenn's flight around the earth was indeed an extraordinary scientific

achievement of universal importance and significance.

It not only was a demonstration of one man's courage and ability but was also a demonstration of a nation's skill, determination and ability to work together: The mechanic, the laborer, the scientist, the sailor, soldier, airman, and marine all joined hands in providing the greatest teamwork ever performed in bringing about the greatest scientific achievement ever attained. This flight was also a dramatic illustration to the world of the difference in the Russian way of life and the American way of life. It must be recalled that the alleged Russian orbit was reported after the flight, that it was viewed only by Russians, that no member of the international press was permitted to observe the preparation or the flight, whereas the American flight was announced weeks in advance with ample opportunity for the press of all nations to view not only the actual flight but all the preparations. America even broadcast over the airwaves actual conversations with the astronaut so the entire world could understand and note what was being done. America sought to hide nothing; Russia sought to hide everything.

Colonel Glenn's flight therefore demonstrates many things for many people and will, I believe, be a landmark not only in aviation and scientific achievement but in the field of international relations.

Personally and on behalf of all the people of the First Congressional District of New Jersey, I congratulate Col. John Glenn and his fellow workers on an outstanding success.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the people of the 17th Congressional District through me as their Representative express their pride and delight in the accomplishment of Col. John Glenn today. Our congratulations go to him and to the United States as a whole which made this day possible.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the resolution was agreed to unanimously.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, today in an era when there is concern expressed from many sections about the caliber of our youngsters, it is gratifying to receive reports like the one that came to my desk recently from the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This great organization recently conducted a nationwide campaign in the

schools of this country, urging youngsters to express in their own words the meaning of democracy.

I am extremely happy to report that Pennsylvania's winner comes from my own congressional district. He is John C. Mills, Jr., son of Mr. and Mrs. John Mills, of Brodheadsville, Monroe County, an 11th-grade pupil at Pleasant Valley Junior-Senior High School in Brodheadsville.

This young man has put his finger on the true meaning of democracy in his essay, "What Freedom Means to Me."

WHAT FREEDOM MEANS TO ME

(By John C. Mills, Jr., grade 11, Pleasant Valley Junior-Senior High School, Brodheadsville, Monroe County, Pa.)

Freedom is my most precious possession. It is not a possession of unit meaning; it is a possession of many meanings. It is a priceless possession that means many things to many people, and many other things to many other people.

I shall try to tell you what it means to me.

A possession of such ultimate value must be guarded. Hence, freedom to me means that I must not enjoy it without carrying my full load of the responsibility necessary to keep it. I must be constantly on guard for the preservation of my rights and the rights of other people. Freedom is never attained easily; freedom is never kept easily. It is a constant effort that pays dividends tenfold. My point, therefore, is that freedom means first of all responsibility.

But freedom means much more to me.

Freedom gives my mind an opportunity to grow. In other words, freedom gives my mind an opportunity to grow in freedom. It can grow freely as my mind wants to grow. I may read what I want to read. I may associate with whom I want to associate. I may travel when and where I choose. I may gather facts as I go my way. I may weigh these facts, disregard what I choose, keep those I want to keep. My mind grows in freedom without chains to limit its growth. With the facts I keep I may do research and the final conclusions I reach are mine. They are part of me. They are part of the great contribution of mankind to the processes, the flows, of life.

These conclusions are truths as I see them. My freedom gave me the right to do research and establish truth according to my interpretations. Hence, freedom means to me that I may arrive at truth as I see truth, not as someone else sees it. This means that freedom gives me the right to grow.

Therefore, since freedom gives me the right to grow, I may become creative. I may now step forward and create new facts from which new relative truths may be created. This right to create frees me completely and allows me to grow mentally, spiritually, and economically. This growth allows me, in turn, to build upon that which was given to me so that finally I may give back to the world a parcel of something greater than was given me. I am thus serving mankind in a most admirable way; but I am both taking and giving, but my giving exceeds my take.

Freedom in simple words means the right of man to rise above the past and to march forward to better worlds.

OFFICE OF AGING

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I include my statement before the General Subcommittee on Education, House Education and Labor Committee, in support of my bill (H.R. 710) to establish an Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, February 20, 1962:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee; it was 26 years ago that the Nation woke up to the serious and sometimes desperate economic problems of the aged. For many years previous to 1935, this problem had been relegated to the background like the aged themselves.

The harsh realities of the depression stripped away the careless but comfortable attitude of ignoring problems, and revealed the fact that millions of the aged were destitute, or so dependent on others that they were charity cases in the homes of their own children.

The conscience of the Nation was aroused. Through the pressure of public opinion, the Congress passed and the President signed the Social Security Act. At intervals since then, the act has been broadened and strengthened, to provide economic security for the aged.

As time went on we discovered that the monthly social security checks were only a partial solution of the many-faceted problems related to aging. The aged themselves told us of their needs. From the petitions of their various groups and organizations, I select the following as speaking for all. It is the "senior citizens bill of rights," drawn up by the Desmond committee of New York State that appeared in the pamphlet "once in a lifetime," published by the National Association of Retired Civil Employees:

"Each of our senior citizens, regardless of race, color, or creed, is entitled to:

"1. The right to an opportunity to continue to be useful.

"2. The right to an equal opportunity to obtain employment based on merit, not birthdays.

"3. The right to freedom from the specter of want in old age and burial in a pauper's grave.

"4. The right to a fair share of the community's recreational, educational, and medical resources.

"5. The right to obtain decent housing suited to the needs of later years.

"6. The right to the respect of the community, based on service to the community.

"7. The right to the support of one's family to an extent consonant with the best interest of the family.

"8. The right to live independently, as one chooses.

"9. The right to live with dignity as a free human being unfettered by antiquated concepts of the proper role of old people.

"10. The right of access to all available knowledge on how to make the later years happy years."

The Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged and Aging, created by the Senate resolution in February 1959, was the first congressional body delegated to conduct a comprehensive study of all the difficulties faced by the aged and what can be done to ease them. The first major subcommittee report listed 12 recommendations for legislation concerning such problems as the financing of medical care, nursing homes, social security benefits, housing, employment, and social services for the aged.

With several agencies of the Federal Government, each authorized to carry out one aspect of the overall program, and with States, communities, and nonprofit institutions and organizations in the picture, there is apt to be confusion, duplication, and even blind spots of neglect, through lack of coordination.

I believe that your committee realizes the need for a central office to serve as a clearinghouse for information related to problems of the aged and aging; to develop research and demonstration programs; to administer grants that will help the States to develop their programs; to gather statistics in the field of aging that other agencies are not collecting; to stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services; and to assist the new programs as they develop through separate bills that are passed by Congress.

I appear in support of H.R. 710, which I introduced on January 3, 1961. Its purpose is "to present a declaration of objectives for senior Americans; provide for the establishment of a U.S. Office of Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Aging; authorize Federal grants to assist in the development and operation of studies and projects to help older persons, and for other purposes."

H.R. 710 will authorize project grants totaling \$70 million over a period of 4 years to assist the States in furthering the policies set forth in this act. Above all, it will bring together Federal-State-local relationships in the field of the aging on an integrated, across departmental lines, basis.

To coordinate the work of all public agencies from the national to the local level that will be responsible for the comprehensive program to benefit the aging that is well on its way, it is essential to establish a U.S. Office of Aging.

I respectfully suggest that H.R. 710 will be effective in meeting the need.

BULL SHOALS DAM TO BE NAMED HARRY S. TRUMAN DAM

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill providing that the Bull Shoals Dam and Bull Shoals Reservoir be known in the future as the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir in honor of the great former President of the United States.

The Bull Shoals Reservoir is located in the Ozarks of southern Missouri, President Truman's home State, and of north central Arkansas, and extends for a distance of 87 miles along the White River from the Bull Shoals Dam, 10 miles west of Mountain Home, Ark., to the Ozark Beach Dam near Forsyth, Mo.

The project was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1941 for flood control, generation of power, and other beneficial water use.

It is of immense benefit not only to the residents of the area but to the tremendous number of visitors who are attracted to the reservoir because of its recreational facilities. In 1960, for example, more than 2,580,000 visitors enjoyed the lake facilities, which include public boat docks, picnicking and camping areas.

President Truman, both as President and as a U.S. Senator, was an effective advocate of public power and flood-control measures, and in these respects the Bull Shoals Dam and Reservoir have

been of maximum service to the people of the White and lower Mississippi Valleys.

Power generation was started in September 1952 and through June 1960 the project produced 3,782,555,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy which has been marketed through the Southwestern Power Administration, Department of the Interior.

Since July 1951, when filling of the power pool began, more than 35 floods have occurred in the White River Basin which were regulated by the combined operation of the Bull Shoals and Norfolk Reservoirs and, since 1957, Table Rock Reservoir. Flooding was prevented on an average of some 22,380 acres of improved land for each flood.

President Truman gave impetus to the construction of this great project and spoke at its dedication on July 2, 1952.

At that time, the former President noted:

The project would stop floods and produce hydroelectric power, and benefit farm families who need electricity for refrigerators and freezers and hay dryers and feed grinders and a hundred other uses.

That is where this public power ought to go, to lighten the burdens of farmers and workers and housewives, and to give free recreation and pleasure to all people.

President Truman and all other Presidents we have had, of all political parties, have worked diligently toward the goal that all rivers and streams, and indeed all the water resources that we possess, are controlled and developed to serve the people, to give them electric power and clean drinking water and recreation, and to eliminate the scourges of floods and pollution.

Many other dams and reservoirs bear the names of men, in and out of public life, who have led in this great program to harness our waterpower for maximum benefit. The Hoover Dam, for example, pays tribute to a President whose contributions to this goal are immeasurable.

The naming of this dam and reservoir as the Harry S. Truman Dam and Reservoir will give recognition to the President under whose administration and through whose efforts this project was established, and to whom Americans who benefit from the wise use of our water resources owe so much.

It is my hope that the committee to which this legislation is assigned will approve the bill and that it will receive the support of all Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

STRENGTHEN THE HOME FINANCING MARKET

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill (H.R. 10268) which will increase the amount of money available

in the home mortgage market by requiring commercial banks to maintain a certain percentage of their thrift and time account funds invested in long-term loans on real property and a percentage of that invested in home mortgages.

In the past 3 years, Mr. Speaker, we have seen a phenomenal increase in the amount of time and thrift deposits in commercial banks. One of the reasons has been that the banks have increased the interest rate offered on these accounts. At yearend 1959, for example, time deposits in the commercial banks amounted to \$62.9 billion. In 1960 these deposits increased by \$4.1 billion. The 1960 Annual Report of the Federal Reserve noted that this increase occurred after midyear and was the largest July-December increase in the postwar period. As of December 31, 1960, these time deposits in commercial banks exceeded \$67 billion.

This was nothing, however, compared with what was to happen in 1961. By June 30, 1961, time and savings deposits had shot up to \$87.3 billion, an increase in the first 6 months of the year of more than \$20.2 billion.

Let us look for a moment at what was happening to the mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations. In 1959 their combined savings were \$83.1 billion. In 1960 this increased by \$10.4 billion, bringing their yearend total to \$93.5 billion. During the first 6 months of 1961 their total increase was \$9.3 billion. Their estimated increase over the full year is only \$15.6 billion as compared to the commercial banks increase of \$20.2 billion in the first 6 months.

What is apparent here is that the commercial banks are siphoning off a considerable amount of savings dollars. Thrift and time account funds should be invested in long-term mortgages in the residential housing market. One may reasonably ask if this is being done.

With this huge increase in commercial bank time and thrift accounts one would hope that the available money for residential mortgage financing would be increased substantially. This has not been the case. The market has remained fairly steady. I believe that we may assume that the commercial banks have been investing these funds in the short-term market and home financing has been left primarily to the mutual savings banks and savings and loan associations.

We may have no right to require the commercial banks to lower the interest rate they pay on time and savings accounts. We do have the right to require them to maintain a percentage of these funds invested in long-term financing for residential housing. That is all I am asking—a simple measure to assure that thrift and time account funds are kept available for residential housing financing. We all know that the Federal Reserve Board and the FDIC have allowed commercial banks to increase their interest payments on these accounts up to 4 percent as of January 1, 1962.

In view of the 1961 increase in commercial bank thrift and time accounts it appears reasonable to assume that a

similar or greater increase will occur in 1962. The response to this increase apparently has been much greater than anyone had expected. A mid-January survey indicated that about two-thirds of the banks had lifted their rates and that 20 percent went all the way to the 4 percent ceiling on savings and time deposits. Unofficial figures indicate that during the one month of January, 1962, these deposits in commercial banks increased by \$2.5 billion. If this continues, we will have another tremendous increase in these accounts in commercial banks.

The time to act is now so that we can be assured that these funds will be directed into home financing where they are so necessary.

COMMENTS ON AGRICULTURE BUDGET

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. RAINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, the President's budget message to Congress this year was a comprehensive, far reaching, declaration of intent and desired goals.

I believe the budget, on the whole, is realistic. However, there is one phase of the agricultural section, dealing with the conservation effort, to which I should like to address myself.

The President's budget requested an advance authorization for the 1963 agricultural conservation program of \$150 million, which represents a reduction of \$100 million in the amount which has been available to this vital program during the recent past.

Over the past quarter century, the ACP has been a vital force in the battle that has been waged unceasingly to conserve and protect our natural resources of soil, water, and woodland and keep them productive for generations to come.

The specters of eroded hillsides, worn-out fields and abandoned farms have been dispelled, for the most part, through the agricultural programs generated by the Congress. These programs have been based upon the sound concept that the basis of a strong agriculture is productive soil. How well we have succeeded to date is evidenced by the fact that the productive capacity of the agriculture of this Nation is second to none on earth. Our abundance has been felt the world over in the form of food for the hungry and cloth for the naked. We have been generous to the pleas of the past and surely we are but standing at the threshold of the future.

The agricultural conservation program has operated as a vital conservation partnership wherein farmers and the Government join together to perform the needed conservation work on the land, that is in the national interest as well as the interest of the farmer. This program is based on a very frank acceptance of the fact that while needed conservation pays a nation in the long run, many conservation meas-

ures do not offer returns to farmers that are attractive enough in the immediate future to get the needed amount of such practices applied, thus the ACP partnership.

As I drive about the country today, I see many farms on which owners or operators have, to some degree, solved their soil and water conservation problems with the help of the ACP and other conservation services. Generally these farmers are producing more and living better. They are paying more taxes. They are contributing more to make their communities stable and prosperous. All of us are sharing the benefits of continued abundant production that comes from those farms. However, lest we conclude that the job is done and the problems solved—preliminary data, from the recently completed inventory of soil and water conservation needs, indicate that two-thirds of our farmland still needs conservation treatment. This being the case, I would like to go on record early in this session of Congress in support of a \$250 million advance authorization for the ACP in 1963 in lieu of the \$150 million requested in the President's budget.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader if he can tell us at this time, and if he cannot, we will all understand, as to the program for the balance of the week.

Mr. ALBERT. Of course, as the gentleman knows, the House was advised on yesterday that a resolution dealing with the reorganization plan creating a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing would be called up under a privileged resolution tomorrow. So far as I know that matter will be called up tomorrow. Beyond that, I have no statement to make with reference to the program for the balance of the week at this time.

Mr. HALLECK. I thank the gentleman.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, on the rollcall vote in connection with the debt limit bill, I was unavoidably detained and could not be on the floor of the House. I ask that the Record show had I been present at that time on the floor, I would have voted for the rule.

BILL TO MODIFY THE LIMIT UPON THE DEDUCTION FOR ADDITIONS TO RESERVE FOR BAD DEBTS OF SAVINGS AND LOAN ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly obvious that both the Congress and the public understand that mutual financial institutions should pay some additional taxes over their present payments and above those paid by their account holders on dividends. I feel that my proposal will not only bring in substantial tax revenue but it is fair and equitable for all mutual financial institutions, unlike the tax formula which the Treasury has suggested to the Ways and Means Committee.

Clearly the Treasury-suggested formula, which is based on the amount of an institution's growth in its mortgage account, will result in great unfairness. Under varying growth conditions small institutions might be paying large taxes, while big institutions paid virtually nothing. The formula would also cause inequities in various areas of the Nation where growth rate differs with the result that some institutions would be tax free, others burdened.

The bill which I have introduced for the consideration of the committee and all Members of Congress who are studying the question proposes a program which will produce some \$175 million in tax revenues—on a basis which is fair and equitable to all concerned. As an example, in 1962 it proposes to raise \$100 million from the mutual savings and loan associations and cooperative banks; \$25 million from the private stock savings associations; and \$50 million from the mutual savings banks whose assets are about two-thirds as large as those of the mutual savings and loan associations. In terms of total assets, mutual savings and loan associations account for \$70 billion; stock associations \$10 billion; and mutual savings banks \$55 billion, 90 percent of which is in New York and Massachusetts.

Mutual savings banks will not be the source of as much a share of taxes due to their large holdings of tax-free municipal bonds and tax-free public housing bonds.

Mr. Speaker, the bill also takes into consideration the fact that there is every reason in public policy to provide a different type of taxation for the mutual financial institutions as compared to the guaranty stock associations which are prominent in California and Ohio and more recently in Maryland and Illinois. This difference in the two types of institutions was clearly and succinctly spelled out on pages 171 to 173 of the penetrating report of the Commission on Money and Credit. However, may I emphasize that the stock operation in Ohio is remarkably clean in comparison to the other three States.

This bill provides taxation for 25 percent of the net annual earnings of mutual institutions. This ratio is necessary to permit the transfer to loss reserves of funds sufficient to cover losses as is required by law and by State and Federal supervisory authorities.

Private stock associations are taxed in the same way as commercial banks and other private stock corporations. They

are permitted to retain all reserves accumulated up to this time and they are allowed a tax-free debt reserve approved by the Secretary of the Treasury just as is provided for commercial banks.

I believe that this proposal will not only raise a fair and reasonable amount of tax revenue, but will also close the tax haven for private stock associations. It will also end the speculation in savings and loan holding company shares and the conversion of mutual institutions to stock associations for the benefit of a few insiders.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal is completely fair to the mutual savings and loan associations, cooperative banks, mutual savings banks and other financial institutions of a purely mutual character. Certainly the private stock savings and loan associations cannot object to being treated in the same tax manner as other American stock corporations.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE VERSUS SOCIALISM IN SOUTH AMERICA

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, last year this Congress, at the request of the present administration, enacted into law a comprehensive foreign aid measure, known as the "Act for International Development."

This act embraces the administration's alliance for progress, under which the administration hopes Congress and private enterprise will provide assistance to the Republics of Latin America to the extent of approximately \$2 billion per year for 10 years.

While that bill was under consideration, Members of the Congress were repeatedly assured by administration spokesmen that American private investment would play a strong and increasing role in bringing this needed developmental capital to Latin America. In fact, the very preamble of the act states:

It is the policy of the United States to strengthen friendly foreign countries * * * by minimizing or eliminating barriers to the flow of private investment capital.

The events of this past weekend in Brazil raise serious questions as to whether the laws and policies we have so recently enacted in fact minimize or eliminate barriers to the flow of private investment capital to Latin America. These recent events create grave doubts as to whether the law, as enacted, adequately protects our private investment in Latin America. Further, it appears very doubtful that the administration intends to fulfill the policy in favor of American foreign investment which we incorporated in our aid legislation last year.

On Friday the government of one of the states of Brazil seized and confiscated a privately owned and operated

telephone company, a subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph Corp. At the time of the seizure the local officials publicly announced that they would pay only the equivalent of 400,000 American dollars for this property, an amount which is said to be only approximately 5 percent of its true worth.

There are several important things to note about this seizure. In the first place, the Government of Brazil and the state government immediately concerned have steadily refused to guarantee U.S. private investors against the confiscation of their properties. Under the law we enacted last year, the U.S. Government is given no new authorities to protect against this type of cold-war risk. Nothing can be done unless the country itself will agree to do so. And nothing in the act requires the administration to negotiate toward these ends as a basis for furthering the aims of the Alliance for Progress. Thus, we appear to have left our private investments at the mercy of foreign governments.

Secondly, our Government has thus far taken no step under the power it always has had to rescind or defer foreign aid to Brazil in order to bring about a reversal of this act of outright confiscation. Unless this is done, U.S. foreign aid, in effect, will help to finance the confiscation of private property belonging to American citizens.

On Saturday, our Department of State issued a public protest against the seizure. In this protest, our Government recognized Brazil's right to seize American properties, provided adequate compensation is paid. Why do we have to lead off with the idea that any amount of state ownership of productive facilities is quite satisfactory to us? Unless we are trying to encourage these nations to move further into economics at the expense of private enterprise? In addition, it is true, the protest deplored the seizure as contrary to the spirit of the alliance for progress since it would absorb Brazilian funds which might otherwise go into needed improvements and developments. But it failed entirely to convince the reader that our Government felt that socialism was an inferior system to private enterprise and accordingly would take some concrete steps to promote this idea and to discourage and frustrate these kind of seizures.

In my judgment, gentlemen, the State Department protest is an inadequate response to this flagrant takeover of American properties, particularly since, by implication of neutrality on our part, it invites Brazil and all other Latin American nations to use our aid to force American firms out of business in Latin America.

Third, while the act of confiscation was that of a state of Brazil rather than the national government, the latter did exhort the state officials to negotiate the confiscation price. Nevertheless, the national officials disclaimed any ability to really control the acts of their state officials. This raises further serious questions. Are our policies for aiding Latin America to be thwarted by such legalisms? I understand also that the pittance offered for the property—a

mere \$400,000—may not be convertible into U.S. dollars in any case and may have to remain in Brazil to be eroded by inflation, since Brazil has also refused to enter into a treaty guaranteeing the convertibility into American dollars of local currencies owned by Americans.

Fourth, I call the attention of this House to the fact that at the very moment these outrageous events were taking place in Brazil our Government and the Government of Brazil were engaged in negotiations looking toward our granting to Brazil \$1 billion in current foreign aid.

Fifth, we should not deceive ourselves into believing that we can win the cold war against the Communists in these contested lands by submitting to and so encouraging the political and economic actions which follow the theories of communism, not private enterprise and representative government of men such as Gov. Leonel Brizola, of the State of Rio Grande do Sul. The New York Times of Sunday, February 18, describes him as a leftwing nationalist, whatever that is.

I believe the Members of this House will agree with me when I say that it is now time to ask the administration some pertinent questions with regard to our aid policies. Are we going to continue to provide vast amounts of foreign aid to countries which breathe defiance and hostility against the theories of the private enterprise system and of representative government? Is it truly in the interests of the United States to provide foreign aid through the governmental officials of Latin American countries who follow Communist theories and who refuse—as did Brazil at Punte del Este—to even denounce communism in our hemisphere, and who, while clamoring for our aid dollars, use them to steal our private properties in defiance of the very policies which should be clearly laid down in the aid legislation?

But this is not the end of these apparently conflicting policies. Last year on the very heels of the administration's presentation of the aid program to this Congress, the administration brought to the Ways and Means Committee a series of tax measures which would further stifle the flow of private investment capital to underdeveloped areas such as Latin America.

These tax proposals would sharply increase U.S. taxes upon earnings derived from investment in Latin America, thus discouraging the making of needed new job-creating investments there. Chief among these measures, as they apply to Latin America, was the so-called gross-up. Worldwide in its application, this new tax measure, which reverses a U.S. income tax rule of more than 40 years standing, would have its greatest adverse impact in the less-developed areas such as Latin America. This is for the reason that corporate income tax rates in such countries are lower than the U.S. tax rate. Hence, any increased U.S. tax on the difference will have its greatest effect in retarding U.S. investments there. In substance, the gross-up proposal levies a new U.S. tax upon the

amount of tax already paid out to the Latin American governments—a double tax, if you please—since it is imposed on moneys which can never reach our shores.

Serious doubt must exist over whether or not the Ways and Means Committee and the Congress will finally endorse a tax measure which flies directly in the face of an aid policy explicitly designed to engender more—not less—private capital investment in Latin America. Yet I can assure the Members of this House that the administration appears determined to continue to press this gross-up tax proposal with all of the lobbying tools at its command.

We now have a duty to ask the administration and they have a duty to provide a clear answer to the question: What rationale, what foundation of consistency, what ultimate logic lies in the espousal of these conflicting policies? A policy to stimulate capital flow to Latin America is utterly inconsistent with an aid program which tolerates and, indeed, finances the confiscation of American investments once they are made. What possible justification can conceivably exist for the imposition of a new burden of U.S. income tax upon the very American firms best equipped to help increase the flow of private investment capital to Latin America?

Gentlemen, the inconsistency and self-defeating nature of these policies is becoming apparent, an inconsistency made even more transparent by the sad event which took place in Brazil this past weekend.

I have concluded to press for specific answers from the administration to some of the profound questions raised by this seizure and the administration's current tax proposals. For this purpose, I am today directing a letter to Secretary of the Treasury Dillon. I do so for the obvious reason that he took the leading role for the administration in the presentation to the Congress of the aid program as well as these tax measures.

I hope the Congress will be given specific answers to the following questions, among others:

First. Is it not in the best interests of the United States to deny foreign aid to governments who engage in the confiscation of American properties?

Second. Is not such confiscation contrary to U.S. public interest even if full compensation is paid?

Third. Should the United States, through its foreign aid program, finance the takeover of American investments in Latin America, directly or indirectly?

Fourth. Should we not devise a system of guarantees against political and cold war risks which does not depend for its efficacy upon the whim of a foreign government? I refer specifically to guarantees against expropriation, inconvertibility, riot and acts of war which Brazil and other Latin American countries have refused to adopt.

Fifth. What justification can possibly be shown for the enactment of new tax measures that will retard private investment in the underdeveloped countries,

frustrating a policy which we enacted into law only last year?

Gentlemen, it is obvious that this Congress is being asked to enact a collection of inconsistent laws, including the tax proposals and the new reciprocal trade bill now pending before the Ways and Means Committee. The Congress is entitled to clear and concise answers to these questions from the administration before we proceed further to enact either the pending tax legislation, the reciprocal trade bill, or the pending foreign aid requests.

FARMERS REFERENDUM NOT A FAIR CHOICE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. SHORT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, as I study the provisions of H.R. 10010, I am more and more concerned with the threats being made to farmers, the effect of which is: "If you don't buy my program, I will use the power of the Federal Government and the huge stocks of Commodity Credit commodities to make you wish you had. I will break your market."

Mr. Speaker, one of the salient features of the Agricultural Act, from the very beginning, has been outlined and revised in the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and is known as section 407. The Congress very wisely anticipated that there might come a time when we would have a Secretary of Agriculture who was so intent on forcing his program on farmers that the power of the Commodity Credit and the Department of Agriculture would be used.

Thus, the language in 407 is very clear with regard to this matter. Of course, the broad powers given the Secretary of Agriculture for administering these programs can be used always as an umbrella or an excuse for doing a great many things that are very detrimental to farmers. However, let me quote a few lines from section 407:

The Corporation shall not sell any basic agricultural commodity or storable nonbasic commodity at less than 5 per centum above the current support price for such commodity, plus reasonable carrying charges. * * * Nor shall the foregoing restrictions apply to sales of commodities the disposition of which is desirable in the interest of the effective and efficient conduct of the Corporation's operations because of the small quantities involved, or because of age, location or questionable continued storability, but such sales shall be offset by such purchases of commodities as the Corporation determines are necessary to prevent such sales from substantially impairing any price-support program, but in no event shall the purchase price exceed the then current support price for such commodities.

The Department of Agriculture is about to make a laughingstock out of the referendum process. They say in the proposed legislation now before the

Agriculture Committee—which is 106 pages of regulations for farmers—that “yes; we will give farmers an opportunity to vote in a referendum with regard to these programs we are proposing.” But, let us consider for a moment the choices available to farmers in such a process. The Secretary of Agriculture, in this bill, says, in effect: “It will be my program or no program at all; and if you disapprove the program I am advocating, I shall dump on the market 10 million tons of surplus feed grains, which is equivalent to about 357 million bushels of corn.”

Mr. Speaker, to attempt to coerce corn and feed grain producers to vote for an unsound program through the threat of breaking the market by injecting at harvesttime—or any other time for that matter—large quantities of corn or other feed grains, is unheard of. I have observed these programs for many years—beginning with Henry A. Wallace in the 1930's coming through Mr. Wickard, the Honorable Senator Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary Brennan, Secretary Benson—and always the Secretaries have administered section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 in a most satisfactory manner. They seemed to recognize that to cause farmers to try to compete with the huge stocks of CCC grain would be completely out of order and, in fact, would be violating the spirit and intent of the law.

This is not so in the current situation—because we have seen in 1961 the Secretary of Agriculture use Commodity Credit stocks, on the theory that they were out of condition, to dump on the market at harvesttime in 1961 in order to punish the so-called noncooperators and to try to make farmers believe they had better cooperate in the 1962 program.

Mr. Speaker, I think we must keep in mind that when we are talking about feed grains, we are not simply talking of the cash feed grain market but we are involved in a production that directly and indirectly affects more than 65 percent of the farm income. We are talking in terms of between \$20 and \$25 billion in the value of farm products sold as a result of the use of feed grains. And, I say to you again, that one of the most disturbing facets of this whole matter is the stated and deliberate attempt on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture to utilize the all-powerful centralized Government to force farmers into line. I am sure the Congress of the United States will not sanction such a procedure and will, in fact, pass legislation limiting his authority to utilize these stocks.

Yesterday, when appearing before the House Agriculture Committee, Secretary Freeman—in defending the provision in H.R. 10010 relative to selling Commodity Credit Corporation feed grains in the event farmers would turn down the Department's plan in referendum—stated that this was less authority than the Secretary has under present law. This is true with regard to the present temporary feed grain program, but not so far as wheat is concerned.

It would be impossible for a real free market to work with the Government liquidating its stock of surplus grain at the rate suggested in H.R. 10010, on the American market. I cannot see why these surpluses of both wheat and feed grain could not be disposed of overseas under the food-for-peace program instead of being dumped on the American market in competition with current farm production.

PROPOSED COLD WAR GI BILL TO PROVIDE EDUCATIONAL AND VOCATIONAL TRAINING BENEFITS

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST. GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the cold war GI bill which I introduced today will provide educational and vocational training benefits for more than 4½ million Americans who have served in the Armed Forces in the post-Korean period. Though there has been no sacrifice of American lives nor the great period of national suffering that accompanied the Second World War and the Korean conflict, the personal sacrifices and hardships endured during the cold war have been no less significant to the Nation.

The provisions of this bill are designed to restore, in part, the educational and other opportunities lost by the youth of the Nation who have been called upon to give a share of their lives for the defense of the Nation and its principles. The Nation can and should show its gratitude for the efforts of its citizen-soldiers during this period of stalemate and noncombative war. An opportunity should be given to these citizens to rejoin the mainstream of American life after their period of service. The college and vocational training provided under the provisions of this measure will assure these veterans that they have not lost the opportunity for higher education or training and that their careers have not been sacrificed because of their service to the Nation.

This measure is patterned after two of the most successful and far-reaching programs ever enacted by the Congress. The hundreds of thousands of Americans who benefited from the two previous GI bills are the basis upon which our present scientific, social, and economic structure has been built. The United States would be a much different nation had not Congress been willing to invest in the future. Not only did these programs produce college-trained professionals, but needed technicians and skilled workers were provided with the opportunity for on-the-job and on-the-farm training so that they might play their part in the economic life of the Nation.

The expense involved in this program is a self-liquidating debt. No one can deny that this program will cost money,

a great deal of money. However, the educational and vocational training will increase the productive capacity and earning power of the veterans, bringing financial as well as social return to the Nation. The investment is small when viewed in the light of the dividends which will accrue to the Nation after operation of the program.

The measure provides 1½ days of schooling for each day of service, but it should not exceed 36 months of such education or training. Eligibility is conditioned upon 6 months or more of service or a discharge for service-connected disabilities. The monthly allowance for full-time college training would be \$110 if the veteran has no dependents; \$135 if he has one dependent; and \$165 if he has more than one dependent. There are provisions for loan assistance and vocational rehabilitation for disabled veterans as well as for college, on-the-job and on-the-farm training.

Approximately 40,000 Rhode Islanders have served in the Armed Forces since 1955 and would be eligible for the benefits of this legislation. The potential of this measure can be seen in the effects of the World War II and Korean bills. I attended law school under the provisions of the Korean bill as did many of my colleagues. Testimonials to the successes of the two previous GI bills can be found in the ranks of the faculties of our schools and colleges, the professional men of the State, and our young scientists, engineers and executives. They are enriching the life of Rhode Island and the Nation. It would not have been possible without the action of the Congress in approving the earlier measures.

It is my view that even more of a percentage of the eligible veterans would take advantage of their opportunities offered by this measure than did those after World War II and Korea. The great interest in education which pervades the Nation and the increasing number of our citizens who desire higher education foretell events subsequent to passage of this legislation. At the present juncture of world affairs an educated nation is the only nation which can adequately defend the principles and ideas of the United States in the battle for the mind of man which is being waged throughout the world.

This is an important measure with far-reaching effects. Its approval by the Congress will guarantee America a multifold increase in the Nation's most important resource, an educated people.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. HAYS (at the request of Mr. BURLISON), for 4 days, on account of official business.

Mr. BROOMFIELD (at the request of Mr. BURLISON), for 4 days, on account of official business.

Mr. SCHERER, for February 26 through March 6, 1962, on account of discussions on highway legislation at Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Mr. FALLON (at the request of Mr. SCHERER), for February 26 through March, 6, 1962, on account of discussions on highway legislation at Los Angeles and San Francisco.

Mr. ADDABBO (at the request of Mr. GILBERT), for balance of week, on account of illness.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. BARING), on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. MICHEL, for 15 minutes, on Wednesday, February 21.

Mrs. DWYER (at the request of Mr. GOODELL), for 10 minutes, on Wednesday, February 21.

Mr. ROUSSELOT (at the request of Mr. GOODELL), for 1 hour, on February 22.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MORRIS K. UDALL.

Mr. GILBERT.

Mr. BARING.

Mr. ROUSH.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOODELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DOMINICK.

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. VAN ZANDT.

Mr. JENSEN.

Mr. DOLE.

Mr. FINDLEY.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 21, 1962, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1714. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1715. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, relative to the loan of certain naval vessels to the Government of Greece, and to the Government of Korea, pursuant to

section 7 of Public Law 87-387; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1716. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to repeal certain legislation relating to the purchase of silver, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1717. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the July-December 1961 report on Army, Navy, and Air Force prime contract awards to small and other business firms, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1718. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract which will authorize the Yosemite Park and Curry Co., to continue to provide concession facilities and services in Yosemite National Park, pursuant to (70 Stat. 543); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1719. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to donate to the Devils Lake Sioux Tribe of the Fort Totten Indian Reservation, N. Dak., approximately 275.74 acres of federally owned land"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1720. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to provide for the conveyance of 39 acres of Minnesota Chippewa tribal land on the Fond du Lac Indian Reservation to the SS. Mary and Joseph Church, Sawyer, Minn."; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1721. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1722. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to declare that certain land of the United States is held by the United States in trust for the Oglala Sioux Indian Tribe of the Pine Ridge Reservation"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

1723. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to authorize an additional appropriation for the Rama Road"; to the Committee on Public Works.

1724. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to provide for commitments to, maintenance in, and discharges from the District Training School, and for other purposes', approved March 3, 1925, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1725. A letter from the director, the American Legion, transmitting the proceedings of the 43d Annual National Convention of the American Legion, held in Denver, Colo., September 12 to 14, 1961, pursuant to Public Law 249, 77th Congress (H. Doc. No. 345); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

1726. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, and Managing Trustee of the Trust Funds, transmitting the 22d Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to section 201(c) of the Social Security Act, as amended (H. Doc. No. 346); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 3444. A bill to approve an order of the Secretary of the Interior adjusting, deferring, and canceling certain irrigation charges against non-Indian-owned lands under the Wind River Indian Irrigation project, Wyoming, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1365). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. S. 201. An act to donate to the Zuni Tribe approximately 610 acres of federally owned land; without amendment (Rept. No. 1366). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WILLIS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10264. A bill to provide that the House of Representatives shall be composed of 438 Members beginning with the 88th Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 1367). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1299. An act to amend the act of June 4, 1953 (67 Stat. 41), entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior, or his authorized representative, to convey certain school properties to local school districts or public agencies"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1368). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MOORE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 10079. A bill to amend section 104 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1369). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MACGREGOR: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 9612. A bill relating to the elections under section 333 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by the shareholders of the G. L. Bernhardt Co., Inc., of Lenoir, N.C.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1364). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ABBITT:

H.R. 10276. A bill to change the name of the Petersburg National Military Park, to provide for acquisition of a portion of the Five Forks Battlefield, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BECKER:

H.R. 10277. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mrs. BLITCH:

H.R. 10278. A bill making an appropriation to the Secretary of Commerce to enable him to furnish to additional communities in Georgia certain agricultural weather services authorized by law; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 10279. A bill to repeal subsection (d) of section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 10280. A bill to stabilize the mining of lead and zinc in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 10281. A bill to authorize the establishment of a youth camp recreation program to assist those organizations which have for their purpose the providing of healthful outdoor and camp training for indigent children and to inculcate the principles of Americanism and loyalty to the Republic in these children who are its citizens of the future; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 10282. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. DEROUNIAN:

H.R. 10283. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 10284. A bill to amend section 593 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the limit upon the deductions for additions to reserve for bad debts of savings and loan associations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EVINS:

H.R. 10285. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the manufacturers excise tax on mechanical lighters for cigarettes, cigars, and pipes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 10286. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HECHLER:

H.R. 10287. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HERLONG:

H.R. 10288. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HULL:

H.R. 10289. A bill to provide that the Bull Shoals Dam and the Bull Shoals Reservoir, White River Basin in Missouri and Arkansas, shall hereafter be known as the "Harry S. Truman Dam" and the "Harry S. Truman Reservoir"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 10290. A bill to establish an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration; to authorize the preparation of a plan for acceleration of public works when necessary to avoid serious nationwide unemployment levels; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 10291. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 10292. A bill to amend paragraph (6) of section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to the tax on cabarets so as to clarify the period of collection of the special tax imposed on amounts paid for admission, refreshments, service, and merchandise at roof gardens, cabarets, and other similar places; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 10293. A bill to designate the navigation lock on the Sacramento deepwater ship channel project, California, as the William G. Stone navigation lock, to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PELL:

H.R. 10294. A bill to amend the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950 to authorize the payment of rewards to persons who furnish information leading to convictions of organizations or individuals of failure to register as required by such act; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10295. A bill to amend the law relating to pay for postal employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 10296. A bill to facilitate the sale and disposal of Government stocks of extra-long-staple cotton; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H.R. 10297. A bill to amend, clarify and make certain the applicability of section 4233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to exemptions from tax imposed under section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 10298. A bill to provide that Federal expenditures shall not exceed Federal revenues, except in time of war, national disaster, or emergency, and to provide for the retirement of the public debt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWENGLER:

H.R. 10299. A bill to establish a cropland retirement program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YATES (by request):

H.R. 10300. A bill to place nicotine sulfate and nicotine alkaloid on the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 10301. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of State and Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 10302. A bill to establish in the Executive Office of the President an Office of Urban Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10303. A bill to help achieve the objectives of the Employment Act of 1946 by providing standby authority to accelerate capital expenditure programs of the Federal Government and State and local public bodies; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST. GERMAIN:

H.R. 10304. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1963; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.J. Res. 633. Joint resolution to encourage the discovery, development, and production of domestic gold; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.J. Res. 634. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 20, 1962, as National Astronautic Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.J. Res. 635. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim a week in 1963 as National Negro History Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H. Con. Res. 426. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McVEY:

H. Con. Res. 427. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama:

H. Con. Res. 428. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H. Con. Res. 429. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SILER:

H. Con. Res. 430. Concurrent resolution to prohibit training military personnel or aiding Communist nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

Mr. LANE presented a memorial of the Massachusetts House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States to increase the amount of Federal aid authorized to cities and towns in their construction of sewage treatment facilities, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 10305. A bill for the relief of Joo-Yon Ohm-Cederberg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 10306. A bill for the relief of Miss Ita Zwiebel; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 10307. A bill providing that the President shall award in the name of the people of the United States a gold medal to Lt. Col. John Herschel Glenn, Jr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JUDD:

H.R. 10308. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth A. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 10309. A bill for the relief of Ie Liang Pouw, his mother, Tengan Ong Pouw, his wife, Bie In Ijiang Pouw, and his minor children, Jennee Pouw and Sien Wie Pouw; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCSWEEN:

H.R. 10310. A bill for the relief of Gerhard A. Cely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER:

H.R. 10311. A bill for the relief of Elizabeth A. Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON:

H.R. 10312. A bill for the relief of Robert T. Barnes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 10313. A bill for the relief of Luigi and Maria Oppimitti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUSSELOT:

H.R. 10314. A bill for the relief of William Radkovich Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H.R. 10315. A bill for the relief of Walter Wesolowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H.R. 10316. A bill for the relief of Leopoldo Rocha Canas and Teofilo Caelo Servito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.